W. 1504

England's Solution *of* The Liquor Problem

Prepared by the
ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT
NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Research Department
JOHN C. GEBHART, *Director*

Published September, 1930

WELLCOME
LIBRARY
pam
WM 274
1930
A 84e

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

PIERRE S. DUPONT, *Chairman*
ROBERT K. CASSATT
BENEDICT CROWELL
HENRY H. CURRAN
IRENEE DUPONT
GRAYSON M.-P. MURPHY
CHARLES H. SABIN
W. H. STAYTON
JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

LAMMOT DUPONT, *Chairman*
MATTHEW C. BRUSH
ROBERT K. CASSATT
HENRY H. CURRAN
JOSEPH R. HAMLEN
C. WILBUR MILLER
JOHN J. RASKOB
CHARLES H. SABIN
WILLIAM P. SMITH

England's Solution *of* The Liquor Problem

Prepared by the
ASSOCIATION
AGAINST THE PROHIBITION
AMENDMENT

NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Research Department
JOHN C. GEBHART, *Director*

Published September, 1930

Table of Contents

PAGE

THE LICENSING MACHINERY 2
- TYPES OF LICENSES 3
- REGULATIONS AND PENALTIES 5
- HOURS OF SALE 6

DECLINE IN INTOXICATION 7

NATIONAL DRINK BILL 10

THE COMPENSATION ACT 13
- LEVYING OF FUNDS 15
- VOIDING OF LICENSES 15

THE CLUB PROBLEM 19

LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT 21
- ISSUING OF LICENSES 23
- LONDON'S NIGHT CLUBS 24

EMPTYING ENGLISH JAILS 25

PUBLIC HOUSES 27
- THE "TIED HOUSE" SYSTEM 27
- REFORM MOVEMENTS 29
- THE CARLISLE EXPERIMENT 31
- BREWERS' MODEL "PUBS" 36

REVENUES FROM LIQUOR 39

GENERAL CONDITIONS 42

SCOTLAND'S LOCAL OPTION 45

ULSTER AND THE FREE STATE 46

England's Solution of the Liquor Problem

WE SENT a representative to Great Britain in the summer of 1929 to make a thorough investigation into the English liquor licensing system. The results of that inquiry, which lasted three months, are given in this report. They show, among other things:

1. A rapid and steady decline in intoxication over a period of years; in the latest record, convictions dropped from 188,877 in 1913 to 65,166 in 1927 and 55,642 in 1928.
2. The annual "drink bill" has declined from £469,700,000 ($2,285,795,050) in 1920 to £288,200,000 ($1,402,525,300) in 1928.*
3. Consumption of spirits has declined from 31,660,000 gallons in 1914 to 12,881,000 in 1927; beer has gone down from 34,130,000 barrels to 20,819,000 in the same period; wine has risen from 10,630,000 gallons to 16,628,000.
4. The number of public houses has been reduced, through a scheme of buying out licensees with funds paid in by "the Trade," from 99,478 in 1905 to 78,803 in 1928, and this continuing process is accompanied by extensive building of model "pubs."
5. While high prices of liquor and reduced hours of sale have been important factors, the great growth of temperance is due largely to improved living conditions, recreational facilities, outdoor sports and popular education.

A noteworthy feature of the English liquor system is that it has accomplished such impressive results without resort to harsh or unjust measures. Licenses have been, and are being, extinguished, not through confiscation, but with compensation to the owners of redundant houses. The people have not suffered from arbitrary legislation. The licensing justices, with a comprehensive law for guidance, have been enabled to use their own common sense, and have not been bound by rule of thumb. On the whole the system has set in motion a progressing social reform without coercion of the public or undue pressure.

We submit the facts herewith in support of these observations. Generally, they can be

* Wherever English money is quoted in American dollars in this pamphlet, the computation is made at par, viz., the pound at $4.8665, the shilling at 24 cents and the penny at 2 cents.

proved by the official data, as presented, which are taken from government publications. We also gathered in interviews a great amount of information of a sort that cannot be reduced to figures. It represents the opinions of men qualified to speak with authority, including police executives, licensing officials, editors, economists, and leaders respectively in the Prohibition movement and the liquor trade. The figures given, which as a rule are of 1927 or 1928, are the latest available.

THE LICENSING MACHINERY

Liquor licenses must be obtained from justices of the peace. These justices, appointed by the Lord Chancellor, hold office for life, except through disability, misbehavior or voluntary retirement. A justice's jurisdiction extends only over the area—county, city or borough—from which he is appointed. He may be either a layman or a barrister. Generally, justices receive no compensation, but some of them are barristers with salaries, known as stipendiary magistrates.

There are three bodies of justices, two of them passing upon licenses and a third dealing with elimination of redundant "pubs," as follows:

1. The renewal authority. The justices of a Petty Sessional Division, who deal with renewal or transfer of licenses and the granting of new licenses.
2. The confirming authority. In order to be valid, a grant by a Petty Sessional Division must be confirmed by this group of justices.
3. The compensation authority. After the first two groups have successively passed upon the case of a "pub" and found it to be redundant, this third group fixes the sum to be paid the licensee for extinction of his business.

How Licenses Are Granted

Licenses are granted at the Brewster Sessions, held annually in February. A licensing district consists of a Petty Sessional Division of a county, or, when there are no Petty Sessional Divisions, of a whole county (exclusive of a borough having a separate Commission of the Peace).

Licenses ordinarily are granted for one year, but the justices, if they see fit, may give a license for a period not exceeding seven years, instead of renewing an on-license. In that event, an application for a re-grant at the expiration of the term is treated as an application for a new license.

No justice may sit in any deliberations in reference to licensees who holds an interest in brewing, distilling, or the retail liquor trade in his

district or an adjoining district. This disqualification includes the shareholder in a brewery or a distillery in the specified region.

Requirements as to Licenses

Licensing justices have broad powers of a discretionary sort. The applicant must pass muster as to his character and his responsibility. His application must be advertised, and if there is objection to the opening of a "pub" in the neighborhood, the justices must weigh the evidence and decide such points as whether the objection is valid and made in good faith, and whether the community has use for the "pub" as a convenience.

The premises must be structurally adapted to their purpose. If the license authorizes the sale of spirits, there must be two rooms besides those occupied by the tenants, and if spirits are not authorized, there must be one. Consent of the justices must be obtained for any alteration which gives increased facilities for drinking or conceals any part of the premises used for drinking. Connection between the part where liquor is sold and any other part is forbidden.

Premises which rent for less than a certain sum cannot have licenses. The rental is called annual value. The value runs from £10 to £50 or more. Licenses which date back to August, 1872, are exempt from this provision.

Types of Licenses

Justices' licenses are required for all premises where intoxicating liquor is sold, with these exceptions:

1. Theatres and other premises licensed for stage plays, whose license takes the place of justices' license.
2. Premises occupied by freemen of the ancient Vintners' Company. There are thirteen of them in London.
3. Premises of spirit and wine dealers who sell for "off" consumption, provided the premises are used exclusively for sale of liquor and have no communication with other business premises.
4. Registered clubs.

Music halls and motion picture theatres, unlike theatres for stage plays, must have justices' licenses. In these places the bars may be open to customers from the street, but in the straight dramatic houses the bars are maintained for the serving of drinks during the performance.

There are several varieties of justices' onlicenses, which may cover all intoxicants, or beer

and wine alone, or beer alone, for example. Conditions are generally attached with reference to such points as hotel purposes only, restaurant purposes only, or Sunday and holiday closing.

The Occasional License

For any premises, there may be issued an occasional license. This grant may permit a fashionable hotel, for example, to serve drinks to supper parties in public dining rooms after the regular closing time on special occasions like Derby night, or a celebration of an Oxford-Cambridge boat race.

Similarly, in market centres of London, like Covent Garden, a few public houses are permitted to open long before the metropolis is awake, in order to serve farmers and gardeners who bring in their produce from the country around four o'clock in the morning. The special privilege of early opening for these "pubs" carries a corresponding curtailment of their hours of business later in the day.

Varying License Conditions

Concrete examples of new on-licenses give a general idea of the discretionary powers of the licensing authorities. A refreshment room of the Finsbury Park Railway Station, in Islington, London, got a full license for three and a quarter years for £90 in 1928, £105 in 1929 and £120 in 1930, with a condition that it could be open on Sundays until eleven p.m. for sale of non-intoxicants. The fashionable Mayfair Hotel, in Berkeley Square, London, paid £2,500 for a year and a quarter's full license. The new Park Lane Hotel, in Piccadilly, got a full license for a similar period, paying £1,000 for the hotel proper and £50 for its Brick Street annex. The St. James's Hotel, Westminster, obtained a full license, three and a quarter years, "for hotel purposes only," at £4,500 a year.

For comparison with the St. James's fee of approximately $22,500 a year, there are comparatively small levies on humble premises in the provinces. A publican in the Hastings district, Sussex, for example, pays £22 (about $110) in three equal annual installments for a three-and-a-quarter years' license, with "no bar."

The Croydon Aerodrome near London is permitted to supply only travellers by airplane to or from Paris and officials and staff of the Air Ministry.

Thus, an elastic licensing system gives the justices rather wide latitude in restriction or extension of sales privileges in order to fit local or special requirements. These discretionary

powers are limited by rigid provisions of the Licensing Act of 1921, which leaves the British publican virtually no leeway in reference to what he may or may not do in the selling of liquor. Public needs and public welfare are fundamental principles of the English system.

Regulations and Penalties

For selling liquor without a license that authorizes the sale, an offender is penalized as follows:

First offense: Fine up to £50, or imprisonment with or without hard labor for a term not exceeding three months.

Second offense: Fine up to £100, or a similar imprisonment.

Third offense: Fine up to £100, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months.

On a second conviction, the person may be ordered disqualified for the holding of any justices' license for a term not exceeding five years. For any subsequent offense, the disqualification may be for any term of years, including the defendant's life time.

A holder of an off-license who permits the drinking of liquor by a purchaser either on the premises or on an adjoining or nearby highway is liable to a fine of £10 for the first offense and £20 for any subsequent offense.

A fine not exceeding £30 is provided for "long pull," i. e., the supplying of liquor gratuitously in excess of the amount for which the purchaser has asked. The "long pull" was once a bait for increasing of trade.

Liquor Sales to Children

The sale of intoxicants to a person under eighteen, for consumption on the premises, is forbidden, except that beer, porter or cider may be sold to a person over sixteen with a meal which is not served at an open bar. The penalty is twenty shillings for a first offense, and forty for a second. Not only the seller, but the young person who attempts to buy may be fined.

Sales to minors of liquor for consumption by another person off the premises are permitted only in corked or sealed containers and in quantities of not less than one pint.

No child under fourteen is permitted to be in a public house bar, except as it may be necessary to pass through. This regulation does not apply to railway refreshment rooms or similar places in which the bar business is merely auxiliary. The fine is £2 for a first offense, and £5 thereafter.

Credit Sales Barred

Sales on credit for consumption on the premises are forbidden under penalty of a fine not exceeding £30. A licensee may not permit wages to a workman (except in his employ) to be paid on the premises.

Gambling on licensed premises is forbidden. This restriction applies to the taking of bets or the playing of a game for any stake. A single bet is not an offense, nor is the holding of a Derby Sweepstake.

Special licenses for music and dancing are required in territory within twenty miles of the City of London, or "within the jurisdiction of any urban sanitary authority."

The "Bona Fide Traveller"

An on-license holder may sell intoxicants to be consumed on the premises "at any time to persons lodging in his house, or, except where the license is a six-day license and the sale is on Sunday, to *bona fide* travellers." The *bona fide* traveller is defined as follows:

> A person for the purposes of this Act shall not be deemed to be a *bona fide* traveller unless the place where he lodged during the preceding night is at least three miles from the place where he demands to be supplied with liquor, that distance to be calculated by the nearest public thoroughfare.

Different Hours of Sale

Hours of sale on week-days are limited to nine in the Metropolis, which means the administrative County of London and any other territory within four miles of Charing Cross, and eight, or eight and a half, in other parts of England and Wales. On Sunday, the total is five hours throughout England. In Wales and Monmouthshire, Sunday sales are prohibited.

For the Metropolis, hours of sale are governed by the following schedule:

> On week-days: Nine hours between 11 A.M. and 11 P.M., with a break of at least two hours after 12 noon. In any licensing district, the justices may fix the hours within these limits. In the absence of special ruling, the hours are 11:30 A.M. to 3 P.M., and 5:30 P.M. to 11 P.M.
>
> On Sundays, Christmas and Good Friday: Five hours, of which not more than two may be between 12 noon and 3 P.M., and not more than three between 6 P.M. and 10 P.M. Except where justices rule otherwise, as above, from 12:30 P.M. to 2:30 P.M. and 7 P.M. to 10 P.M.

For the territory outside the Metropolis, the hours are:

On week-days: Eight hours between 11 A.M. and 10 P.M., with a break of at least two hours after 12 noon. But justices in any district may extend the hours to eight and a half, provided these are not earlier than 9 A.M. and not later than 10:30 P.M.

On Sunday, Christmas and Good Friday: The same as in the Metropolis.

Why Sales Hours Vary

There are eighteen licensing areas in the County of London, to wit:—Seventeen Petty Sessional Divisions and the City of London. In eleven of them, the week-day hours for sales are 11. A.M. to 3 P.M., and 5 to 10 P.M.; in six, they are 11:30 A.M. to 3 P.M., and 5:30 to 11 P.M., and in the Ancient City they are 11:30 A.M. to 3 P.M. and 5 to 10:30 P.M. The Sunday hours are either 12 to 2 or 12:30 to 2:30, in daytime, and 7 to 10 at night, except in Wandsworth, where the evening hours are 6 to 9.

These disparities in hours produce odd results in some neighborhoods. On the north side of Oxford Street, in the fashionable West End, there is ten o'clock closing, but on the south side the bars are open until eleven. The north side is in the St. Marylebone district, and the south in St. James's, which includes Westminster. Westminster embraces the theatre district, where there is night life. The Oxford Street boundary of St. Marylebone is virtually part of theatre-land, also, but the rest of that district has no need of bars after ten o'clock, in the opinion of the authorities.

A resident of the Newington district, which is across the Thames from the House of Parliament, has only to go over the bridge, after his "pub" closes at ten o'clock, and patronize the bars in Westminster, which keep open until eleven. Newington has had too many water-front "pubs," which are being steadily weeded out, and early closing is held desirable there.

In clubs, restaurants, dining rooms of hotels and bars giving restaurant service, drinks can be bought for one hour after the official time for closing the bar, provided the purchaser orders them with food. After this last added hour, there is no way to buy drink in these places.

DECLINE IN INTOXICATION

Convictions for drunkenness in England and Wales declined from 188,877 in 1913, the year

before the World War, to 65,166 in 1927 and 55,642 in 1928, according to the latest official report of the Home Office (Licensing Statistics, 1928). In 1914, the year in which the war began, there was a drop of 5,049 from the preceding year. Subsequent sharp declines may be attributed largely to the exodus of soldiers to the front. A rise to 76,988 in 1919 followed their return to civil life and also an influx of post-war industrial alcohol. With the gradual restoration of normal peace conditions, the decline that had set in just before the war again became evident.

The week-end is productive of most of the drunkenness, according to Licensing Statistics, 1928, which states (page vii):

> Alike in England and Wales, some 60 per cent of the total arrests leading to convictions took place at week-ends. In England (excluding Monmouthshire) the figures for Sunday are 9 per cent and Monday 12 per cent while for Wales and Monmouthshire, in which there is Sunday closing, the corresponding figures are Sunday 5 per cent and Monday 14 per cent.

1928 Compared with 1913

The decrease in convictions for drunkenness in the last fifteen years is shown, by districts, in Licensing Statistics as follows:

Year	Northern England	Southern England	Greater London	Wales
1913.....	99,255	13,228	65,488	10,906
1928.....	25,530	4,328	23,641	2,143
Decrease....	73,725	8,900	41,847	8,763
Per cent. of decrease...	*74.*	*67.*	*64.*	*80.*

In twelve different districts, comprising England and Wales, the decline from 188,877 in 1913 to 55,642 in 1928, has afforded the following comparisons with 1913 and 1927, which give also some idea of the occupational characteristics of the different regions:

	Number of Convictions (1913)	Number of Convictions (1928)	Decrease Per cent on 1913	Decrease Per cent on 1927
Four Northern Counties	18,452	4,508	75.6	11.5
Lancashire and Cheshire	38,633	8,917	76.9	19.1
Yorkshire	18,801	6,087	67.6	17.9
Midland Mining and Manufacturing Counties	17,209	5,114	70.3	8.1
Glamorgan and Monmouth	8,925	1,429	84.0	21.4
County of London	54,556	20,440	62.5	15.1
Home Counties (around London)	13,368	3,852	71.2	7.8
Adjacent Agricultural Counties	2,634	1,001	62.0	0.9
Eastern Agricultural Counties	4,712	1,110	76.4	10.4
Western Agricultural Counties	3,616	810	77.6	21.1
Southwestern Agricultural Counties	4,709	1,418	69.9	13.3
Rest of Wales	3,262	956	70.7	12.1
Total	188,877	55,642	70.5	14.6

In the Border Counties

In the four northern counties—Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland and Durham—there are mines, steel mills and manufacturing plants. Cumberland and Westmorland are thinly populated. Yorkshire is a seat of industrial activity, principally mining and manufacturing. The counties with the highest per cent decrease—Glamorgan, in Wales, and Monmouth, on the Welsh border—have a large population of Welsh miners. The typical Welsh miner is known as a heavy drinker.

NATIONAL DRINK BILL DROPPING

The annual drink bill of the United Kingdom has dropped from £469,700,000 in 1920 to £288,200,000 for 1928, or from £10 per capita to £6 9s. 6d. (See Table I, page 47). While these are not official figures, they are computed by the foremost Prohibition organization in England, the United Kingdom Alliance, which has made a similar calculation annually for forty years. Mr. George B. Wilson, secretary of the Alliance, has estimated the drink bill for recent years.

Favorable as the trend appears, the liquor trade contends that the method of calculation used by Mr. Wilson makes the totals larger than they should be. The Brewers' Almanack (p. 140) states:

> For the year 1902 the values of the liquors consumed were suddenly raised by the late Dr. Burns. British spirits, up to 1901, had been calculated at 20s. per gallon, and other spirits at 24s. Then they were taken together and averaged at 22s. 6d. per gallon. Again, beer had always been estimated on the basis of 54s. per gallon, but is now put down at the excessive figure of 60s. The expenditure on the old basis in 1901 was £3.16.4d.; on the new basis it would stand at £4.7.8d., an increase of 14.8 per cent.

Increased Prices of Liquor

The decline in consumption of intoxicants has moved further than the decline in expenditure indicates, for the price of liquor has been greatly increased. A bottle of whisky cost four shillings at retail in 1914; today it costs twelve shillings and sixpence. The required strength, which was 20 per cent under proof (45.7 per cent alcohol) before the war, has been reduced to 30 per cent under proof (40 per cent alcohol). Changes in taxation and price have been as follows:

Spirits

	Approximate Duty per Bottle (1–6 gal.)		Retail Price per Bottle	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
1913-14.....	1	11½	4	0
1918-19.....	3	6	9	0
1919-20.....	5	10	10	6
Since 1920....	8	5½	12	6

	Duty per Pint	Retail Price
	d.	d.
1913-14	¼	2½
1918-19	1	5
1919-20	2¼	6
1920-23	3¼	7
Since 1923	2¼	6

Per Capita Consumption

Since 1914, when the World War began, per capita consumption of beer and spirits in the United Kingdom has declined and that of wine has increased (see Table II, page 48).

The drop in beer from 26.66 gallons in 1914 to 16.96 in 1927, and in spirits from 0.69 to 0.29, in the same years, does not afford an entirely parallel comparison, because the present Irish Free State is counted into the totals prior to 1923.

The post-war years have seen a heavy reduction in spirits consumption in England and Wales. The total has dropped from 15,562,229 gallons in 1919 to 10,403,630 in 1927. This has given a per capita reduction from .42 gallons to .26, or 38 per cent.

CUTTING DOWN PUBLIC HOUSES

The downward trend in the convictions for drunkenness, the consumption of liquor and the national drink bill has been accompanied by a progressive reduction in the number of public houses. On-licenses (for selling liquor to be drunk on the premises) have been cut down from 99,478 in 1905 to 78,803 in 1928, or from 29.27 per 10,000 population to 19.96 per 10,000, a reduction of 32 per cent. Off-licenses in the same period dropped 3,216—from 25,405 to 22,189—or from 7.47 per 10,000 population to 5.62. There were slight increases in 1926, 1927 and 1928. (See Tables III and IV, pages 49-50.)

The reducing of the number of licenses, a continuing feature of the English liquor system, involves methods which are in our opinion highly significant. No less an authority than Dr. Ivan Bratt, father of the Swedish system, has evolved a broad theory that the voiding of a license only serves to make another license more valuable to

the holder. But in England, gradual elimination has produced benefits quite apart from those accruing to the surviving licensees. The work has been done there by a selective process, instead of a rigid system or an arbitrary law. Licenses have been continued, or extinguished, or even granted for new premises, in accordance with conditions prevailing in the district under consideration, the justices having been guided by the reasonable requirements of the population and the social characteristics of the neighborhood.

Number of "Pubs" Not an Index

We found ample statistical evidence to show that sobriety or inebriety in England was attributable to general conditions—social, economic or industrial—rather than to the number of public houses in which residents could drink. Tables V and VI (see pages 51-52) show the number of public houses in relation to drunkenness convictions.

In these compilations of official figures, the county list represents rural regions, while the county boroughs are communities populous enough to be separate administrative units; so, the two tables reflect, respectively, country and urban conditions.

The figures generally support the fundamental principle that the liquor problem in Great Britain, as elsewhere, is urban and not rural, for the drunkenness convictions in the boroughs, per 10,000 population, are considerably higher. There are also variations within each table which indicate that it is the daily life of the people, rather than the existing number of public houses, which works for or against alcoholic excesses.

In the county list, Northumberland, with a rate of 19.99 convictions per 10,000 population, is a habitat of miners, to whom life means hard work and meagre pay. Durham, with a rate of 14.07, is also a mining region. Yorkshire (13.46) has mines and industrial plants. Mining is the chief industry also in Carmarthen (19.60) and Pembroke (18.96). Only eight counties in the list of fifty-two show more than ten convictions per 10,000 population. Four of these are to be found in the group of ten having the smallest number of "pubs" per 10,000 inhabitants.

Variable Conditions in Cities

The borough list reflects conditions of a different sort to be found in urban life. Canterbury has the largest number of "pubs" (46.10) per 10,000 in any borough outside the City of London, but it shows only 4.57 convictions. Bootle, with the smallest number (2.41) had

15.34 convictions—more than three times the rate for Canterbury. The one is an ancient cathedral city, and the other a relatively poor suburb of Liverpool.

The high record of the City of London—302.31 "pubs" and 228.89 convictions—is misleading, as an index. In day-time, the "City" is a hive of activity, with tens of thousands of busy people, but after night-fall it is as deserted as Wall Street at that time. The resident population has drifted away of late years; it numbered only 13,709 in the census of 1921, and presumably has dwindled still further since then. In the rate of convictions, day-time drunks are charged against the little colony of residents.

Among the other leading cities in the rate of convictions are Middlesbrough (69.25), a congested industrial city in Yorkshire; Salford, a slum-suburb of Manchester; Liverpool, with great shipping trade and seamen on shore-leave; Manchester and Birmingham, with extensive mills and factories; Burton-on-Trent, renowned for its breweries, and two cities on the Tyne—Newcastle and South Shields—where there are big shipyards. Except Burton, none of these places has so many "pubs" per 10,000 residents as Oxford (26.97), but that historic city, with its university atmosphere, shows a rate of only 5.92 convictions.

THE COMPENSATION ACT

A Royal Commission, which made an exhaustive survey of the licensing system in 1896-1899, reported among other things a need for prompt and sweeping reduction in the number of licenses. There were majority and minority reports, which differed in respect to the method of reduction. The crux of the question lay in compensation of publicans who should lose their licenses. The commissioners agreed that such publicans had no legal claim for damages, but confiscation of their business was not attempted. The minority report held that there should be compensation "as a matter of grace and expediency, though not of right," while the majority recommended compensation "on grounds of justice and expediency." The minority also favored a plan whereby there would be a seven-year time limit, after which licenses could be extinguished without payment to the holders. The majority suggested a review of the plan, for readjustment, every seven years.

Out of these recommendations there emerged a sweeping reform embodied in the Licensing Act

of 1904, known as the "Balfour Scheme." Notwithstanding subsequent changes in the licensing law, the Balfour Scheme is still in operation. It provides for Compensation Funds which are raised by taxation against licenses issued prior to 1904. It is of peculiar interest, in our opinion, as an illustration of a practical method of weeding out public houses without resorting to unjust or inequitable processes.

$96,000,000 for Compensation

Under the Balfour Act, £19,847,785 ($96,589,250) has been disbursed in England and Wales since 1905 for the elimination of redundant public houses. There is a Compensation Fund in each county and county borough. In reference to the operation of the Compensation Act, the following points may be borne in mind:

1. The law is applicable only to extinction of old on-licenses, i. e., those granted originally prior to August 15, 1904, when the Compensation Act was passed.
2. Where a license is to be extinguished with compensation, the question is put before the Compensation Authority in the area as to whether the premises are superfluous to the requirements of the locality.
3. If the licensee is at fault, as when he has been guilty of misconduct, or his place is a rendezvous for disreputable persons, or the premises are structurally disqualified, compensation is not granted; in fact, under the Licensing Act, 1910, it may be withheld on the ground that he "has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment (other than intoxicating liquor) at a reasonable price, or . . . has failed to fulfil any reasonable undertaking given to the justices on the grant or renewal of the license."
4. The Compensation Fund is established and maintained through assessments on holders of old licenses only.
5. Compensation awards represent the total of three items, as estimated by officiating justices: (a) the difference between the value of the premises as licensed and their value without license, (b) the amount of depreciation of trade fixtures due to refusal to renew license, and (c) the cost of structural alterations, if any, required in order to use the property for other purposes. In the case of "tied houses," which are operated by breweries, the awards include also a sum based on the brewers' profits on the liquor supplied.

How Funds Are Levied

The maximum charges for compensation levy (Third Schedule, Part I, Licensing Act, 1910) are £1 a year on premises with an annual value* under £15; £2 on £15 to £20 value; £3 on £20 to £25; £4 on £25 to £30; £6 on £30 to £40; £10 on £40 to £50; £15 on £50 to £100. The brackets thereafter run in multiples of £100 value, with a levy of 10 per cent of the top figure, up to £90 on a value of £800 to £900 a year. On an annual value of £900 or more, the maximum levy is £100. So, the maximum levy is graduated irregularly in such a manner that while the highest and the lowest values pay 10 per cent, the values of £40 to £50 pay 20 per cent or more.

The Compensation Authority in each area may fix the levy at any part of the maximum or even decide that no levy shall be made for the year. If a levy is made, it falls upon every old on-license; but hotels pay one-third of what is charged in other cases, and "not less than one-third" is paid by entertainment places, railway refreshment rooms, restaurants—premises where the holding of a license is merely auxiliary.

Amounts paid into the Compensation Fund and average disbursements per license are shown in Table VII on page 53.

20,675 Licenses Weeded Out

The part played by the Compensation Act in the elimination of licenses is shown in an official tabulation covering the period from January 1st, 1905, up to 1929 (see Table VIII, page 54). Renewal of 16,124 licenses with compensation and 569 without compensation was refused. Licenses which lapsed from other causes numbered 6,224. During the period the justices had reason to grant 1,772 new licenses, which left a net decrease of 21,145 in the twenty-four years. The total number of existent on-licenses in the last year of the period (1928) was 78,803.

The Home Office's Licensing Statistics, 1928, states that in England, in 1927, seventeen areas imposed charges at less than half rates, eleven at half or greater, seventy-three at maximum, and thirty-five waived the levy. In Wales, five Compensation Authorities certified the levy to be unnecessary, eight charged at half or greater rates, and three at maximum.

A Record of Five Years

The latest report of the Commissioners of Cus-

* Annual value is the yearly rental fee.

toms and Excise, (1927-1928), presents a summary for five fiscal years, ending March 31st, as follows:

Year (Ended 31st March)	Amount of Compensation Levy Collected	Areas Imposing			Old On-Licenses Refused (Scheduled for Compensation)
		Maximum Levy	Levy Less than Maximum	No Levy	
	£				
1923–24	828,034	94	34	23	410
1924–25	832,652	91	40	20	429
1925–26	777,610	83	38	30	449
1926–27	769,514	86	34	31	454
1927–28	761,157	79	35	38	388

Factors in the Compensation Scheme

A tabulation covering the year 1928 shows how the compensation levy has been adjusted in more than forty localities, with population, number of on-licenses and convictions for drunkenness in each, for purposes of comparison. The figures are compiled from statistical tables in the Home Office's Licensing Statistics report (see Table IX, page 55).

While some of the figures are serviceable only for purposes of general comparison, in the absence of official explanation, others bear *prima facie* indications of the purpose of the Compensation Authorities. In Lancaster, for example,

which is the heart of the textile industry and includes both Manchester, a great manufacturing city, and Liverpool, with its extensive shipping, the levy is fixed at the maximum, except in a few localities.

In Northumberland, there are great shipyards along the banks of the Tyne, from Newcastle down to Tynemouth, and the number of public houses is large. They pay the maximum levy in that region, while the rest of Northumberland, being outside that compensation area, pays only a quarter of the maximum levy.

The evidence of official reports indicates that the definition "redundant," as applied to public houses doomed to disappear, is not construed by the Compensation Authorities to mean that they shall only strive to maintain a rigid ratio between the number of premises and the number of residents. Social conditions in the community are also taken into consideration.

Compensation Proceedings in Court

Compensation cases are referred by the Renewal Authority to the Compensation Authority for decision. In the County of London, the Authority is the Court of Quarter Sessions, which sits four times a year, as its name indicates, and which is comprised of district justices, presided over by a county judge.*

A report of the Licensing Committee of the County of London for the January Quarter Session, 1929, illustrates proceedings in reference to licensing and compensation. Forty justices, representing sixteen Petty Sessional Divisions, had been appointed the preceding January to serve during the year as the County Licensing Committee. This committee received ninety-two applications for confirmation of various kinds of licenses. It refused twelve of them and granted eighty. Of those granted, forty were for "intoxicating liquors," and the remaining forty were in ten different classes, embracing spirits, wine, beer, cider and "sweets" (certain native wines).

For the Compensation Fund, the maximum rate had been levied for the year 1928-1929. The estimated revenue therefrom was £150,000, and there had actually been received £148,181,-13.4d. At a preliminary meeting in May, 1928, reports had been received from eight districts referring thirty-eight licenses for compensation, of which thirty-six had been sent forward for hearing at the principal meeting.

* The justices of the City of London, sitting *en banc*, act as the Compensation Authority there.

Hearings for Licensees

When these thirty-six licenses came before the Compensation Authority in the following July, the Renewal Authority and the opposition, respectively, were represented by counsel, and both sides presented evidence to show cause why licenses should be renewed or extinguished. In the result, agreements were arrived at whereby thirty-one of the licenses were sent forward for compensation. The remaining five cases were referred to the Commissioners of Internal Revenue for final adjudication, a procedure prescribed by the Licensing Act. For this appeal, the licensee must pay the costs. There is no appeal from a decision to extinguish a license, but the commissioners fix the compensation where the amount is disputed. The testimony on these appeals is chiefly that of valuers.

A statement of the amounts allowed by the Compensation Authority itself in 1927 shows that there were twenty-eight cases, and in only one of them (£3,018) was the claim of the licensee allowed in full; in one other, for £2,577, no specified amount was claimed. The reductions ranged from £3,838 for the Prince of Wales, in Bermondsey, which asked for £14,712 and got £10,874, to £340 for the Old Brewery Tap, Tower Division, which received £3,410 on a claim of £3,750.

The total of claims before the Compensation Authority was £75,036, and the total allowed was £61,042. Three appellants, who had taken their cases up to the Internal Revenue Commissioners with demands for £13,477, got £11,140.

The Committee at the January Quarter Session submitted to the court for confirmation a report asking that the maximum compensation charge be authorized for the coming year. That formality fixed the rate.

Compensation and Enforcement

The Compensation Act naturally has a strong deterrent influence on holders of old on-licenses who might otherwise be disposed not to obey the law, for a public house which is not properly conducted is not entitled to a money award for the revocation of its grant.

As a great majority of the publicans—it has been estimated at 90 per cent—are backed by brewers, it is up to the brewers' agents to see that the law is obeyed. The brewers share in awards for extinguishing of licenses in which they have an interest.

THE CLUB PROBLEM

A conspicuous defect in the English licensing system lies in its inadequate provisions for the regulating of clubs. We found that fault was very generally admitted by licensing authorities, police officials and lay observers. "Every one knows that something should be done about it," we were told, "but no one seems to know what to do."

While the number of on-licenses in England and Wales has been reduced from 99,478 in 1905 to 78,803 in 1928, or by 20,675, the number of clubs (see Table X, page 56) has risen for the same years from 6,589 to 12,775, an increase of 6,186. Thus, while the "pubs" were cut down approximately 20 per cent, the clubs increased nearly 50 per cent.

Any twenty-five persons may open a club, with liquor privileges, by going through a simple form of registration with the police and paying a five-shilling fee. No license is required. On registered premises of the kind, liquor may be sold within the hours prescribed for public bars. A club is exempt from police inspection, except under search warrant. Although sales to non-members are forbidden, the membership qualifications are often so meagre as to be almost imperceptible. If the twenty-five promoters are not disreputable and will pay nominal dues, they can set up shop and enroll more members at will.

A great majority of the clubs are of the type known as "working men's." The term is a misnomer to the extent that the members are not necessarily laborers or artisans, as distinguished from other employed persons; but it means, roughly, an organization in which "a man's a man for a' that." Some working men's clubs accept women as members, and some others admit them as guests of their husbands. Many of them are operated on beneficent or philanthropic lines. For example, there is the Working Men's Club and Institute Union, which embraces more than 2,600 units with a membership of nearly 1,000,000 persons. This federation, which holds member clubs strictly accountable for law observance, fosters athletics, recreation, education and social betterment. There are also many clubs allied with the political parties.

All Clubs Alike Legally

Bona fide working men's clubs are humble copies of dignified clubs in London's fashionable West End; and it cannot be justly assumed that they are collectively less law-abiding. Yet, under

English law, there is not a curb against mushroom organizations which are no more than liquor dispensaries with a club camouflage. Owing to the absence of ordinary police inspection, what goes on in such places is not known, unless there is a flagrant breach of law and order. Nor are they responsible to the licensing bench. There are many instances in which public houses have been closed, with compensation awards to the owners, only to be reopened a few weeks later as clubs, which are exempt from ordinary liquor taxes, paying only three pence in the pound for intoxicants purchased for members. The club subterfuge thus makes it possible to evade taxation, licensing restrictions and police regulation.

This defect in the English liquor system has been inherited from a day long past when the club and the public house were not related. Under the law, a club is a home, the members constitute a family, and food and drink within the walls are their common property. No person who is unwelcome may enter without a search warrant. To paraphrase an axiom, "An Englishman's club is his castle."

Several schemes of club regulation have been advanced. Prohibitionists have demanded that right of inspection be given the police, and some of them have sugared the pill with a proviso that the officer must be above the rank of constable. There have also been recommendations that organizers of a club post heavy bonds against law violation, that more than twenty-five charter members be required, and that the five-shilling registration fee be increased.

In our opinion, these proposals would not cut the knot, in which there is a tangle of legal, social and political strings. There is apparently no valid precedent on which to base legislation encroaching on the principle that safeguards the privacy of the home. Even if there were, a basic law could not be destroyed or vitiated, we were told, in order to cope with a minor liquor complication. Moreover, it was impressed on our representative that the English practice was not to enact experimental laws affecting people's daily life or habits, in order to see how they would work out, but rather to "make our laws as we go along."

No Class Legislation

This respect for the sanctity of fundamental laws figures in the social aspects of the problem. Conditions in an humble club in the slums of London are diametrically opposite to those in an

aristocratic club in Pall Mall. Regulations for the one presumably would not fit the other. Yet, the two are identical units in law, and they have to be treated as equals. If there is to be police inspection, it is argued, the rich and the poor alike must admit officers of the law, for there must be no class legislation.

Politically, the club question is a thorny one for party leaders. Working men's clubs, which are jealous of their privileges, represent hundreds of thousands of votes. A great many of them are outright political organizations. In the Association of Conservative Clubs, for example, there are approximately 600 units with 500,000 members. Similarly, there are Liberal groups. The present Labor Government, especially, leans on working men's clubs for support. Any party sponsoring radical or oppressive legislation in regard to clubs would manifestly have to answer at the polls for its course.

It should be borne in mind that the club question in England is not wholly a liquor problem, but one that may embrace gambling and forbidden revelry in general. Nor is there evidence to show that many clubs breed vice or violate the law. But the situation itself is unsound in respect of liquor, we believe, because the law does not enable the licensing bench to impose restrictions beyond limited hours of sale, or the police to enforce them.

LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT

In respect to enforcement and observance of liquor regulations, we gathered the opinions of police and other officials in such cities as London, Liverpool, Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester and Carlisle, in addition to a great deal of non-official comment by newspaper writers or editors and other private citizens who had observed conditions in various parts of Great Britain. Our conclusions represent a composite of that evidence, part of which came from sources as high as the Home Office and Scotland Yard, and pertinent licensing statistics.

The gist of our informants' opinions was that publicans obeyed the law, with rare exceptions; that violations were neither organized nor widespread, and that petty infractions were not important enough, in either volume or frequency, to attract public attention. The minor delinquents were generally proprietors of "pubs" or inns in rural regions, who locked their doors at

closing time but occasionally permitted a handful of favored customers to remain behind. These transgressors, we were informed, did not make a practice of after-hour sales, but could sometimes be persuaded by neighbors to stretch a point for friendship's sake.

The correctness of the information given in our interviews was indicated by statistical data. There were 78,803 on-licenses in England and Wales in 1928, and 698 licensees were convicted of offenses, or less than 1 per cent of the total number.

Character of Offenses

According to Licensing Statistics (1928), from which the foregoing figures are taken, the great majority of infractions had to do with closing regulations. Convictions were recorded as follows:

	England	Wales
Permitting drunkenness or selling to drunks	37	19
Permitting children in bars	7	2
Selling to persons under 18	11	4
Offenses against closing regulations	425	93
Other offenses	88	12
Total	568	130
GRAND TOTAL		698

Of the grand total of 698 convictions, offenses against closing regulations accounted for 518, or more than 73 per cent. A further analysis of the figures indicates, as did our interviews, that this chief source of law infractions represented scattered and desultory cases in rural communities, rather than a general condition among public houses everywhere. The County of London recorded four convictions of license holders for after-hour sales, out of a total of nine for all causes. "The City" had three convictions, all for closing-time violations. Manchester listed five convictions, all for serving customers after hours. Of Sheffield's eleven convictions, seven were under closing regulations. Convictions of every description in other centres of population make up such totals as: Liverpool, 4; Leeds, 1; Newcastle, 2; Birmingham, 3; Plymouth, 1; Southampton, 2.

Why Publicans Fear the Law

The publican who breaks the law risks forfeiture of his business for trivial profits. He is "penny wise and pound foolish." New licenses are extremely hard to get, and old ones are valued. Before a new license is granted, the authorities have assured themselves, by thorough investigation, that the licensee will run his place properly and obey the law. In the case of old licenses, the holder knows that if his place is closed for violations, he forfeits compensation.

While it is true that the erring manager of a "tied house" may be ousted without forfeiture of the license by a brewery, a decision in the important case of Sharp vs. Wakefield, rendered in 1901, lays responsibility on the brewer-landlord to this extent:

> Any objection which relates to the character of the applicant, or to the manner in which he and his predecessors within a reasonable limit of time have conducted the business of the premises in respect of which the renewal [of license] is sought, will be deemed to be relevant.

Insurance as a Deterrent

Most of the public houses are under the constant surveillance of representatives of insurance companies. One of these companies, which has on its books from 60 to 80 per cent of the on-licenses in England, insures the holder of the license against losses incurred through any or all of the following stated causes:

1. Character and capacity of the tenant or his servants.
2. Conduct of customers.
3. Action of the Temperance (Prohibition) Party.
4. Action of the police.
5. Uncertainty of the standard which the magistrates in the various districts and in different years may adopt.

The insurance policies stipulate that license holders must report to the insuring company every irregularity in connection with his premises which is officially recorded.

Clubs and Their Conduct

In the year 1928-1929, when England and Wales had 12,775 registered clubs, proceedings were brought against 182 of them in England, through which 668 persons were convicted and 135 organizations were struck off the register. Wales' record presented twenty-six proceedings, all of which resulted in convictions, and twenty-three clubs were struck off the register.

We found that while the club situation was generally deplored by the police in English cities with the notable exception of those in Manchester, there was little concrete evidence on that point. Official opinions were confined, substantially, to complaints that the police did not know what was going on in clubs, that they should have the right of inspection in order to enforce the law, and that the club system should therefore be thoroughly overhauled. A constable might have good grounds for suspecting certain premises, but he could not lawfully get facts with which to bring offenders to justice.

Officials in Manchester could not explain how or why that city had escaped the club annoyance. It had simply happened, so far as they knew. The nature of the problem in London was clear in one particular, because London, as one of the urban playgrounds of the world, had been afflicted with night clubs.

Scotland Yard and the Night Clubs

In his report for the year 1925, Commissioner Horwood, of the Metropolitan Police (Scotland Yard), noted an increase in the number of registered clubs. He stated, in part:

> While it is not suggested that this increase is due entirely to the advantages these clubs enjoy as compared with licensed houses generally, it is undeniable that the difficulties with which the Police are confronted in detecting any infringment of the Law on club premises is conducive to the opening of clubs which practically owe their existence to the facilities they offer for the consumption of liquor in prohibited hours.
>
> Successful proceedings for breaches of the Licensing Acts in Clubs have been instituted during the year in 38 cases, the majority of these being West End "night clubs," and six principals have been sentenced to terms of imprisonment. The fines and costs imposed amounted approximately to £4,800. Fines will never stop this class of offense.

London's Night Clubs

Commissioner Horwood's 1927 report contained the following observations on the club situation:

> Breaches of the law relating to liquor in clubs continue to be a source of trouble to the Police. In many cases the difficulty of securing evidence upon which action can be taken is very great, although the fact that the law is being broken is perfectly well known. Such

cessful proceedings have, however, been taken in 57 cases, and in 46 of these the clubs were struck off the register. . . .

A feature of the "Night-Club" business is the frequency with which the proprietors or managers are aliens.

Before Commissioner Horwood had opportunity to render another annual report, the club evil hatched a scandal that caused him to retire. It was disclosed in 1928 that Scotland Yard, theretofore considered a pillar of British rectitude, had been besmirched with graft. The Commissioner was not implicated, but certain subordinates had accepted bribes from night club proprietors for protection. In consequence, Lord Byng, who had won fame in the World War and afterward had been Governor-General of Canada, became Commissioner of Police. In his report for 1928, he made the following statement:

> There is again an increase in the number of registered clubs. . . . Successful proceedings for irregularities were taken in 57 cases, and in 41 of these the clubs were struck off the register. Of this number 24 belonged to the category of "night clubs," and 10 were betting and gaming establishments.
>
> . . . In the case of one club . . . the proprietor, being an alien, was deported by order of the Secretary of State. Beyond doubt, the moral of this deportation has not been lost upon other aliens who, although prepared to break the law at the risk of a fine, are not disposed to run the risk of deportation.

As to Illicit Stills

The Customs and Excise Report for the year 1927-1928 gives the following figures for detection and seizure of illicit stills:

Year	England	Scotland	Northern Ireland	Total
1923–24	4	7	139	150
1924–25	2	12	73	87
1925–26	3	12	58	73
1926–27	7	13	72	92
1927-28	6	11	52	69

EMPTYING ENGLISH JAILS

While the United States under Prohibition is wrestling with a grave problem of overcrowded prisons, the question in England is not what to

do with prisoners but what to do with prisons. The average number of daily prisoners, as shown in the accompanying table, has dropped from 21,710 in 1910 to 9,508 in 1926, or from 60.7 per 100,000 population to 24.3. Fifty-seven local prisons in 1910 had been reduced to thirty-one in 1926.

That this decline has continued since 1926 is indicated by an announcement early in 1930 that the government had definitely decided to close Maidstone and Plymouth jails, and that the famous Pentonville prison probably would be razed, tentative plans to use the site for other purposes having been formed. Maidstone prison is one of the three convict institutions to which penal servitude prisoners are sent.

It is virtually impossible to make any dependable estimate of the volume of crime attributable to liquor in England. We believe that it is true also in other countries, except in the United States and Finland, where it is possible to segregate violations of the Prohibition laws and trace various types of offenses directly to illicit liquor

Average Number of Daily Prisoners in Local and Convict Prisons in England and Wales

(*From Prison Reports*)

Year	Number	Rate per 100,000 population
1910	21,710	60.7
1911	20,264	56.0
1912	18,989	52.2
1913	18,410	50.3
1914	17,056	46.1
1915*	14,641	41.5
1916*	10,406	30.0
1917*	9,206	26.9
1918*	8,728	25.7
1919*	8,302	23.4
1920*	8,758	23.5
1921	9,827	25.9
1922	10,991	28.8
1923	10,478	27.3
1924	9,961	25.7
1925	9,556	24.6
1926	9,508	24.3

* Rates per 100,000 based on civil population only, but figures from 1914 to 1918 include military prisoners convicted of civil offenses. Juvenile offenders are not listed in the table

traffic. But the dwindling population of English jails and the diminishing number of prisons are cited here as evidence that prison conditions have improved under the English licensing system.

PUBLIC HOUSES AND PUBLIC HOUSE REFORM

There are several systems in Great Britain which are producing improved public houses, and the old type of insanitary, loosely managed grogshop is being eliminated systematically by licensing justices on the one hand and brewers on the other. Except where modern model "pubs" have been established, the houses generally are on a level with the neighborhoods in which they are situated.

The principle of disinterested management is one of the outstanding theories in public house reform programs. It calls for eliminations of private profit, beyond a reasonable dividend, as a means of preventing publicans from pushing sales of intoxicants. The different schemes of public house operation may be summarized as follows:

1. Disinterested ownership and management by the state, or by the municipality, or by some public body committed to that principle.
2. Disinterested management under companies formed with a public object, such as Trust Houses, Ltd., and the People's Refreshment House Association, Ltd.
3. Disinterested management under commercial companies, chiefly breweries.
4. Interested management under private licensees.

The last three of these methods are in general operation at present, and there is also a State Management Scheme at Carlisle, which is a legacy from World War days.

The "Tied House" System

Commercially, the public house problem concerns only the brewing industry. Distillers do not own or operate "pubs." Ninety per cent of all of the public houses are either owned by brewers or allied with them in such a way that the publican is virtually an employee. These places are called "tied houses."

The tied house is a natural development. Years ago, the tavern keeper brewed his own ale. He was unable to keep pace with changing conditions. There arose a need for large breweries to make sufficient beer and ale and to practice

economies of quantity production. The big brewer in turn could not brew a great quantity of beer without knowing where and when he could sell it. He bought public houses to dispose of his goods. As trade increased, he bought more houses.

A sort of chain system of houses began to force the small publican either to quit business or to enlist as a private in the ranks of some brewer. One by one, the independent licensees ran to cover, until the tied house system embraced approximately nine out of ten of the houses.

Mergers in the Brewing Trade

Just before the World War, the brewers found that they were overreaching themselves. Under stress of competition they paid exorbitant prices for licenses. Some of the well-known companies were on the verge of bankruptcy, but they had to continue to fight for trade or go under. The war relieved the strain, at least to the extent of halting the ruinous competitive buying of public house licenses.

A wide spread scheme of mergers got under way. The big brewer began swallowing up the little brewer, just as the little brewer had previously absorbed the independent publican. High prices were paid in these transactions. Shareholders in small concerns often made enormous profits in selling out. The process was costly, but it stabilized the industry. Breweries today are paying rich dividends. High prices, reduced gravity of beer and ale, reduced taxes, and elimination of ruinous competition have benefitted the trade.

Thousands of public houses are today controlled by brewing companies. One London firm alone has 1,300 "pubs," and in Birmingham another controls more than 1,200 and actually operates approximately 800.

The Tied House Controversy

In our opinion, the tied house system is neither so bad nor so good as it has been painted, respectively, by its opponents and its champions. Much of the criticism has come from prohibitionists, to whom only extermination of trade in intoxicants is acceptable. The tied house has been condemned also by honest observers who believe that private ownership should be supplanted by government control, as in Canada. The pith of their argument has been that a situation is anomalous in which the State at once adopts restrictive measures to further temperance and leaves the trade in the hands of

individuals trying to increase their profits by selling more liquor.

Advocates of tied houses hold that the system has brought about improved conditions—better public houses, better management, and better service to customers. They insist that 1,000 houses, under the efficient control of one brewery, maintain high standards that could not be achieved if the trade were distributed among 1,000 different publicans in competition. Such houses are under systematic inspection. The publican is responsible to the inspector, the inspector to the brewer, and the brewer to the licensing bench.

We believe that one fault of the system—apart from any industrial or economic factors, with which we are not concerned—lies in the temptation for the brewer to sell inferior beer. Weak beer means low duties. In 1921, average permitted gravities ended and control of wholesale prices was abolished. At the present rate of duty each degree of gravity represents a little more than 1s. 9¾d. (44 cents). The point in this connection is not that beer should necessarily be stronger, but that competition is hardly keen enough to drive inferior beer off the market.

OPPOSITION TO REFORMS

Public house reforms in Great Britain have been attended by an incongruous situation in which brewers, as reformers, have been opposed by prohibitionists and, in many instances, by the licensing bench. A considerable number of "drys" have fought improvements on the theory that vile conditions make for abolition of the houses. Opposition from the bench has been due partly to prohibition views of some justices. There was once also a very general impression among magistrates that it was their duty to abolish the liquor trade by degrees. That impression, to which the adoption of the Compensation Act gave rise, has now been modified, and the tendency today is toward regulatory or corrective action.

A later development in licensing practice has had to do entirely with structural conditions. No structural alteration in a public house can be made without the justices' permission. Justices once weighed applications on the theory that enlargement of a bar meant greater drinking facilities, which in turn meant more intoxication. The activities of prohibitionists, fighting the brewers' every step, helped keep that fallacy alive. This opposition tended to maintain con-

gested conditions, with insufficient light and ventilation.

Some experimental movements, including the State Management Scheme in World War days, proved that spacious bars, light and airy and clean, did not promote intemperance; men were less likely to get drunk there than in dark, foul, crowded "pubs." That fact having been established, the justices now allow more latitude in public house improvements, as a result of which the pre-war type of "pub" is gradually disappearing, although still numerous.

The Old-Style Public House

Considerably less than a quarter of the public houses are of the new model type. The old-style places are of countless varieties; but they have many characteristics in common. They were apparently planned with a theory that cramped quarters made them cosy and homelike, and that more or less screened stalls, known as "snugs," should be provided for customers. The worst of these places, or at least most of them, have been either improved or abolished, but there is much that remains to be done in that field.

It is not uncommon, especially in large cities, to see adults with children grouped around public houses on holidays or in the evening. As the law forbids minors in barrooms, the elders with children drink outside. The practice is by no means universal, for many publicans will not serve liquor on the sidewalk. The publican with a sidewalk trade has to use prudence. If there is drunkenness or disorder, he is likely to encounter objections when a question of renewal of license comes before the justices' bench.

The British Barmaid

Employment of barmaids in public houses of every sort has been criticised, especially by prohibitionists and social reformers. Our own observations indicated that the barmaid's temptations were not peculiar to the public house, nor were they much different from those of young women in other humble occupations.

The employment of women behind the bar has been sanctioned in Britain for many generations. Their work is a recognized vocation. They attend to business, and they are wise in the ways of the world. If their morals are questionable, they are likely to follow their bent outside business. But their work is not dissimilar to that of menials in other public resorts.

Snacks and Other Food

The serving of food with drink has been one

of the problems of public house management for some years. Many of the old publicans say that the task of purveying food is a "damned nuisance." On the other hand, it has been insisted that eating should be encouraged, chiefly because a man who takes food with his liquor is less likely to become intoxicated. Justices can refuse a renewal of license if the holder "has persistently and unreasonably refused to supply suitable refreshment, other than intoxicating liquor, at a reasonable price."

The different ways in which the food requirement is interpreted are as numerous as the different types of "pubs." Many bars are in taverns or restaurants where liquor is not the principal source of revenue. In other places, there is sufficient demand for meals at certain hours to make a kitchen profitable. Still other "pubs" maintain "snack bars," where customers can buy sandwiches and perhaps a few varieties of cold viands at a counter.

Except in the improved, or model, "pubs," where ample restaurant facilities are provided, the serving of food has not made notable headway. In 1927, the Southborough Committee, which inquired into Disinterested Management, reported to Parliament:

> . . . the experience of State Management appears to confirm the view which was put before us by more than one witness; that in the main the working man resorts to the public houses for drink and social intercourse with his friend and that, for this reason, in many public houses, no demand for food exists at present.

Another point in connection with food sales is that the wage-earner does not readily spend money for food in a "pub," when he can get it at home or in a boarding house as part of his daily ration. There will presumably be trade always for the "snack" bar, but the buying of meals is largely confined to the "pubs" with restaurants, which are patronized by well-to-do persons, and to the model "pubs," where there is a special inducement for the thrifty workman in the way of low prices. The big model "pubs," run on modern lines, can reach out for this latter class of customers.

The Carlisle Experiment

The most conspicuous movement in the United Kingdom in connection with development and operation of model public houses is the Carlisle and District State Management Scheme, popularly known as "the Carlisle Experiment." This

project is not the most extensive of the systems, nor is it indisputably the best; but it is unique in that it carries out the principle of government ownership and control, and it has proved that the government can run "pubs" along altruistic lines at a profit. There is much debate over Carlisle, and nobody knows whether the government will finally discontinue the enterprise or attempt to introduce the system throughout the country.

"The Carlisle Experiment" is a misleading title. The government went into the project without any other thought than to safeguard and maintain a steady supply of munitions in a World War emergency. The step was purely military; any social benefits that have accrued have been incidental.

There was an acute shell shortage in 1915. The British government took over a tract on the Solway Firth nine miles long and a mile wide for the site of a munitions factory. This huge plant, whose units were widely separated on account of the danger of explosions, ran from Longtown, England, to the neighborhood of Annan, Scotland, and embraced the villages of Gretna, Springfield and Dornock. An army of men and women workers was imported, numbering approximately 20,000. The towns of Dornock and Springfield were built for them, but on the whole the housing conditions were wretched.

The munitions workers, including a large percentage of Irish navvies, swarmed into Carlisle to spend their weekly holidays. They were a wild crowd, reckless, unruly and squandering war wages. They overran the "pubs," and both in the streets and on the trains there were drunken, fighting crowds. The police of Carlisle, which had been a placid and orderly city of 50,000 before the war, were unable to handle the situation. The disorder, which had become grave in the Spring of 1915, increased to such an extent that in June, 1916, the Central Control (Liquor) Board, which had been created in the war, went to Carlisle, ready to take summary measures. The Board's specific purpose was "to solve a perfectly definite problem—namely, the outbreak of drunkenness."

First Steps at Carlisle

It seems worth noting, although the point is not made in official reports, that England at this time was conserving alcohol for use in making munitions, and grain for food purposes; but even those two considerations, plus the drunkenness in Carlisle, did not cause the Board to decree

Prohibition for the district. Instead, the five local breweries and the public houses were acquired by purchase. (Similar action was taken later in the Cromarty Firth area, North Scotland, and the Enfield Lock District, England. The Enfield and Cromarty schemes have since been discontinued.)

There were 119 licensed premises in the Carlisle area. By December 31, 1918, the Board had closed fifty of them. To accomplish this reduction, amounting to 42 per cent, would have taken twenty-five years' time, under the Balfour Compensation Act. Licenses for off-sales were reduced from more than 100 to fewer than twenty. Only the old Carlisle Brewery was kept in operation. Blending and bottling of spirits, which had been done in a dozen stores, was confined to one central depot. Reconstruction of public houses got under way.

Rationing of liquor was part of the problem. A ticket or card system was considered, but was rejected, owing to "difficulties and objections." Instead, a certain quantity was allowed each house and divided into specified portions for each opening period, and managers were instructed to stop selling after taking in a fixed amount of money. In further development of this rationing plan, off-licenses were cut down to six in number, and the house quota system was imposed on the managers.

Carlisle as It Is Now

The Carlisle Scheme now covers an area of roughly 300 square miles, except that government control is not complete in Wigton, Maryport, and Aspatria. There are fifty-nine pubs in the city, as against 116 in 1916, and 108 outside as against 174. The operating staff includes general manager, assistant general manager, superintendent of managed house department, inspectors, stock-taking department, accounting staff, brewery manager, brewers, catering superintendent.

The whole system is under a local advisory committee of eighteen persons representing varied interests. In addition to the Mayor of Carlisle, ex-officio, there are three women from Carlisle and Cumberland County, a fourth member representing the county, and other members from the City Council, the Watch Committee, the Carlisle licensing justices, the Cumberland Joint Committee, the Cumberland Licensing Committee, Wigton justices, Maryport justices, Maryport District Council, and Maryport Trades Labor Council.

The composition of this advisory committee is not fixed by law, the membership being chosen under the general direction of London, where the government officers in charge of the State Management Scheme have their headquarters.

What the "Pubs" Are Like

The public houses range from small buildings, with rebuilt interiors, to attractive stone structures of two or three stories. All of them are clean, well-lighted and well-ventilated. Advertisements of liquor are not displayed, but there are signs listing sandwiches and other food at low prices. In some of the places, the manager receives a commission of 75 per cent on profits from food sales; in others, where there is a distinct restaurant trade, this commission is not given. The idea is to promote food sales as much as possible, and also encourage drinking at tables, rather than at bars, where there is likely to be congestion, with the attendant evils of drinking in crowds.

The newer buildings are picturesque in design and fittings. Outer walls of rough hewn stone, leaded window panes, and thatched or tiled roofs are common. The interior accommodations include assembly rooms; rooms for men alone, for women alone, or for mixed parties; smoking rooms; dining rooms, and restaurants, in some of which no intoxicants are sold. Tiles or flags for the floors, and oak furniture upholstered in leather are typical of many of the rooms. Houses near factories or other industrial plants provide pay-and-carry food service so that children can be sent there with containers to be filled with hot viands to be taken home. The kitchens and lavatories are faultless in appointments and sanitation. In the rear of several of the houses there are spacious, well-kept bowling greens, where nominal fees are charged for playing.

The Financial Side

On March 31st, 1928, the end of the fiscal year, the Carlisle Scheme had repaid in full, with 5 per cent interest, the money advanced by the government. In other words, the government had bought out the liquor interests, cut down the number of "pubs" by half, replaced others with model buildings—all accomplished at large expense—and yet established a profitable business along the lines of sound, social reform. The financial statements of the management are issued in skeleton form, many of the details not being made public, but an idea of the balance sheet can be got from these figures in three annual reports:

(Shillings and Pence Omitted)

Year	Capital Assets	Working Capital	Trading Profit*
1926	£ 992,296	£ 113,234	£ 103,680
1927	1,005,671	101,643	90,713
1928	1,024,390	102,772	80,350

* Trading profit after deductions for depreciation, administrative expenses and insurance. The enterprise is exempt from payment of corporation and income taxes, but it pays local rates (taxes) or contributions in lieu thereof.

Cash registers are used in nearly all of the Carlisle "pubs," but the management depends chiefly on inventories to balance receipts and sales. The manager of each house makes a daily bank deposit, and the bank in turn renders a daily report of deposits to headquarters and also a weekly report of the daily deposits.

According to a report made by the general manager, the enterprise has profited through three economies—the concentrating of manufactures, bottling and sale, the total cessation of advertising, and the elimination of competition, there being no need for public houses to hold strategic positions, as in the case of the Citadel, where two rival "pubs" were made into one.

Social Welfare Aspects

Although it is not denied that the Carlisle Scheme has given the community clean and orderly "pubs" and has purged the liquor traffic of disreputable features, there is considerable argument as to whether a decrease in drunkenness is due to government ownership.

Local conditions in the area are particularly favorable to the success of state ownership or, for that matter, any other well-conceived reform of the kind. The natives of Carlisle and Cumberland County are traditionally cleanly, thrifty and respectable, and there is no transient population, except in the tourist season. The city contains no slums district; for several years building schemes have been relieving what little congestion there was before the war. In such a setting the drink problem has a background utterly dissimilar to that in London, Liverpool, or the industrial centres of the Midlands.

Residents of Carlisle insist that the district has only returned to normal pre-war conditions, and that if the city had not suffered an upheaval

through the sudden influx of munition workers, drunkenness would have declined under private ownership, just as it has under state management. Their opinion is borne out by police statistics.

What Police Figures Indicate

The highest number of annual convictions for drunkenness in Carlisle in the five years from 1909 to 1913, inclusive, was 260 in 1912. There were in those days approximately 115 houses, which were selling seventeen hours a day (6 a.m. to 11 p.m.). The war years brought reduced hours of sale, but convictions reached their peak at 953 in 1916. They dropped to 320 in 1917, again to 80 in 1918, and to 78 in 1919. There were five privately-owned "pubs" in 1917, four in 1918 and three in 1919. War conditions were disappearing. Yet, convictions rose from 78 in 1919 to 136 in 1920 and 154 in 1921.

After 1921, convictions fluctuated within a small range, but the total of 94 in 1922 was reduced to 60 in 1928. That reduction occurred under the Licensing Act of 1921, which restricted sales to eight hours on week-days and five on Sundays, and in a period through which only fifty-nine houses were in operation. It is true also that Carlisle has only kept pace with the march of sobriety in other parts of England and Wales.

We found that criticisms of Carlisle could be generally traced to one or more of three sources: prohibitionists who opposed the system as a matter of principle, and especially on account of government participation in the liquor business; representatives of the brewing trade, and persons who looked on the innovation as another step toward Socialism. Notwithstanding their strictures, the "Carlisle Experiment" has produced irrefutable proof that public houses, attractive in every physical particular, can be profitably operated by the government in such a way as to promote temperance. The Carlisle houses, moreover, serve as community centres.

The Brewers' Model "Pubs"

The Disinterested Management Scheme at Carlisle has a parallel in a model public house movement on a much larger scale which is being carried out by big brewing companies. This development appears to be an aggressive answer to the challenge of state control. The brewers engaged in it are not posing as philanthropists; their policy embraces a theory that better public houses are insurance against the attacks of temperance reformers.

Assuming that the brewers are out for private profit, while the Carlisle Scheme is entirely altruistic, the two experiments are identical in one salient feature—the principle that public houses with spacious rooms, abundant light and ventilation, and ample facilities for drinking at tables have a tendency to discourage the gluttonous drinking that was an evil in the cramped quarters and hide-aways of the old-style "pub."

The Brewers' Society has compiled information about the new "pubs" for the five-year period 1923-1927. Answers to questions were sent by 324 breweries which controlled 47,224 establishments. The returns showed that 13,542 houses, or more than 25 per cent, had been improved or rebuilt at an expense of £12,365,139—more than $60,000,000.

"The movement is steadily proceeding," the Brewers' Society states in a pamphlet on the subject, "and is being facilitated by the Licensing Benches, many of which are far more ready to co-operate than was the case until a few years ago."

Three or more of the leading brewers in England have gone heavily into the new movement. Other firms have accepted the idea half-heartedly, or not at all; but the growth of the development seems to indicate that they will be obliged eventually to change their policy.

The Birmingham Experiment

Sir William Waters Butler, Bart., is the chief exponent of what may be called the Birmingham Experiment, owing to its similarity to the Carlisle Scheme. He is an advocate of "fewer and better pubs" who has had long experience as a brewer, and was a member of the war-time Central Control Board. His firm controls approximately 1,200 houses and actually manages half that number.

The company has built, and is continuing to build, houses which are much larger than those at Carlisle, although similar in interior appointments. These houses are picturesque architecturally. There are thatched or tiled roofs, bow windows with leaded panes in casements and stained glass ornamentation, imposing fireplaces, studded oak doors—such characteristics as might be found in a pretentious American country club. The facade is likely to overlook a driveway and parking space for automobiles. In the rear, one may find bowling greens, outdoor tables and chairs along paved walks, pergolas, hedged-in playgrounds for children.

Elaborate restaurant facilities may be found in a considerable number of the houses. At mid-

day men and girls from neighboring factories bring their lunches, if they wish to economize, buying only something to drink in return for the accommodations they use. The drink as often as not is tea, milk or coffee; no one is required to purchase intoxicants. Dinners are served also, not only for individual customers, but for parties of a hundred or more. The profits from food go to the house manager, although he is provided, free of charge, with light, heat, and cooking and eating utensils, as well as his lodging, for he lives on the place. He is also on salary. A staff of inspectors makes frequent, but unannounced, visits.

These public houses are meeting places for nearly 4,000 clubs or societies. The social activities, besides dinner parties, include dances, concerts and outdoor games.

A Private Compensation Plan

The Birmingham brewers have a compensation plan of their own, which is a private enterprise and quite distinct from the Balfour Compensation Scheme. They use it in carrying out arrangements made virtually in conference with the licensing justices, where both sides lay their cards on the table in a fair and open discussion.

The main idea is to weed out superfluous or obsolete "pubs" and erect better ones. While British brewers generally admit that there are too many houses, they are apt to disagree on the question, Whose "pub" shall be eliminated? The answer as a rule is, Not mine. Birmingham has found a way of avoiding that impasse. A pool has been made among five brewers—there were originally fifteen—who control 85 per cent of the licenses. Their agreement involves a method of trading in licenses. In a given district, the three "pubs" of A, B and C are to be abolished, the justices having agreed that if that is done they will permit D to erect a model "pub." As E will get part of the trade of A's "pub," which is nearby, he pays an *appreciation* charge. On the other hand, D's new "pub" will cut into the business of F's house, and consequently F collects for *depreciation*. Outright compensation from the brewers' fund is, of course, paid A, B and C besides.

Awards on that basis are computed independently of the licensing justices. There is nothing surreptitious or otherwise irregular about the negotiations between bench and brewer. The conferees simply arrive at an agreement as to what must be done and how it shall be done.

Cooperation is the keynote. The whole method of procedure illustrates the growing tendency of the licensing bench to deal with the public house problem in a fair-minded, practical way.

Trust Movements

The Public House Trust idea was promulgated more than thirty years ago in England as a reform scheme. Under this plan, houses must be places of refreshment and not mere drinking bars, and the salaried managers get no profit from intoxicants but a share from food, or non-intoxicants, or both. Shareholders' dividends are limited to 7½ per cent (the limit was 5 per cent before the war) and there are also restrictions as to the maximum number of shares any one person may hold.

The Trust House movement embraces some 500 houses in England, Scotland and Wales, but relatively few of these places are in the "pub" classification, being hotels, inns and restaurants, where bar trade is a secondary feature. The People's Refreshment House Association, Ltd., has 180 houses and 240 are controlled by Trust Houses, Ltd. Both organizations cater to tourists, particularly motorists of moderate means, and their literature includes booklets containing lists of hotels, accommodations available, prices, etc.

The Trust House movement was presumably a notable innovation thirty years ago, but it is not a major factor in the public house situation today, in our opinion.

REVENUES DERIVED FROM LIQUOR

The United Kingdom derived from the liquor traffic in 1927-1928 a sum representing one-sixth of the total normal revenues, or one-fifth of the total receipts from taxable sources (see Table XI, page 57).

The total receipts of the Exchequer, exclusive of interest payments and moneys raised by creation of debt, were £849,284,120. Customs and excise, which include revenues from liquor, gave £250,820,000 of that amount. Property and income taxes yielded £250,583,000. The return from the liquor traffic was £139,577,268* ($679,252,261).

Liquor revenues make up approximately five times the return from duties on motor vehicles,

* This total is taken from the Alliance (Prohibition) Year Book. The Brewers' Almanack computes it at £200,000 more. The discrepancy is due to the allocation of minor items relating to other industries as well as liquor. We have quoted the Year Book's total as representing an acknowledged minimum return.

twice the total of estate duties, twice the amount of super taxes (surtaxes), six times the amount from stamp taxes, eighty times the amount from corporation profits tax, and twice the sum derived from the Post Office, including telephone and telegraph (see Table XII, page 59).

In Relation to Disbursements

The service of lawful and regulated liquor trade in helping to defray the cost of government can be appraised through a check against the more important disbursements of the national treasury (see Table XIII, page 60).

Liquor pays into the Exchequer more than twice the total sum paid out for annuities and pensions and the maintenance of the Post Office, courts of justice and inland revenue and customs and excise service. For interest, financing and administration, England's national debt involved payment in 1927-1928 of the staggering sum of more than one and three-quarter billion dollars (£378,816,287). The liquor revenues, if applied entirely to the purpose, would have met one-third of the annual debt bill.

Next to the national debt, the cost of national defense is the heaviest charge against the Exchequer. In the years cited, the receipts from liquor would have paid for the entire establishment—army, navy and air—and left a surplus of £20,000,000.

We offer these facts, not in the belief that they are pertinent to the temperance question, but as evidence of the part played by the liquor trade in respect to taxation and the balancing of the budget. We found that prohibitionists in England attacked the use of intoxicants by comparing the annual expenditure for drink with bills for other commodities in such a way that the rate-payer was not reminded of liquor revenues which helped keep his taxes down.

Where the Money Comes From

Customs and excise receipts from liquor have increased from £32,913,000 in 1918 to £139,578,000 in 1928. Beer furnished approximately 60 per cent of the total, spirits about 30 per cent, and wine a little over .3 per cent (see Table XIV, page 61).

Sharp fluctuations in the tabulation of receipts reflect war and post-war conditions. In general the rise in beer, spirits and wine duties in 1919 may be attributed to the return to civil life of demobilized soldiers after November, 1918. Likewise, the post-war financial stringency in that period was attended by a drop of more than 50

per cent in license duty receipts, which did not begin to increase appreciably until 1921.

After 1918 there were heavy increases in duties on beer, wine and spirits. Spirits duties rose from thirty shillings a proof gallon in 1918 to fifty shillings in 1919, and seventy-two shillings and sixpence in 1920, the rate at which they are still taxed. The beer duty went up from fifty shillings a standard barrel* in 1918 to seventy shillings in 1919 and one hundred shillings in 1920. Under that high tax, consumption fell off, and in 1923 the levy was reduced by a rebate of one pound (twenty shillings) a bulk barrel with a minimum tax of twenty-four shillings a barrel, a change which is reflected in the decreased excise. After 1919 wine duty was increased on a schedule based on alcoholic content, foreign or domestic, and bottled or in casks.

The drop in revenue from clubs' duties in 1924 followed a halving reduction from sixpence in one pound to threepence on liquor purchased for supply to their members.

How Retailers' Taxes Are Computed

Excise duties are laid against both off-licenses and on-licenses. Excise is based on "value" and "license value." "Value" is the rental on which realty taxes in general are assessed. "License value" (also called monopoly value) is the amount by which the annual value of the premises, as licensed, exceeds the value they would have if not licensed.

Taxation of Licenses

Holders of off-licenses pay annual excise duties on a graduated scale, according to annual value, as follows:

Annual Value (in Pounds)	Spirits or Liqueurs		Beer		Wine	
	£	s.	£	s.	£	s.
Not over 10.....	10.	0.	1.	10.	2.	10.
10 to 20.....	11.	10.	2.	0.	2.	10.
20 to 30.....	14.	0.	2.	10.	3.	0.
30 to 50.....	15.	0.	3.	0.	3.	10.
50 to 75.....	16.	0.	3.	10.	4.	0.
75 to 100.....	17.	10.	4.	0.	4.	10.
100 to 250.....	19.	0.	4.	10.	5.	0.
250 to 500.....	30.	0.	7.	0.	7.	0.
Over 500.....	50.	0.	10.	0.	10.	0.

* The Standard Barrel, a unit of measurement adopted mainly for purposes of levying duty, represents thirty-six gallons of an original gravity before fermentation of 1055 degrees. In trade the bulk barrel is used and the exact standard barrel is very seldom found, but the duties rise or fall as gravity runs above or below 1055.

There are thirteen classes of annual excise duties for on-licenses, as follows:

1. Public houses (victuallers' licenses):—Half annual value, with minimum of £35; alternatively, where annual value exceeds £500, one-third of annual license value, with a minimum of £250.
2. Beer houses with beer license:—One-third annual value, with minimum of £23, 10s.; alternatively, where annual value exceeds £500, one-third annual license value, with minimum of £166. 13s. 4d.
3. Wine houses:—Annual value, as follows: Under £30, £4. 10s.; £30 to £50, £6; £50 to £100, £9; £100 and over, £12.
4. Beer houses with beer and wine license:—As under Nos. 2 and 3.
5. Cider houses:—Half duty under No. 3.
6. Premises with sweets* license:—Half duty under No. 4.
7. Hotels with victualler's license:—Where receipts from sale of intoxicating liquor are less than one-half in a hotel, or less than three-fifths in a restaurant, of the total receipts, duty in same proportion of full duty payable under No. 1 (or Nos. 2, 3 or 4, according to class of license); alternatively, one-fourth of annual license value. Minimum for fully licensed premises is one-thirtieth of annual value, or in any other case one-fifteenth of full duty payable under Nos. 2, 3, or 4.
8. Hotels with beer, beer and wine, or wine license:—Same as No. 7.
9. Restaurants with victualler's license:—Same as No. 7.
10. Restaurants with beer, beer and wine, or wine license:—Same as No. 7.
11. Theatres:—£20 where annual value does not exceed £2,000; otherwise, £50.
12. Public buildings, places of entertainment, public gardens, exhibitions, railway refreshment rooms, or other premises where license is merely auxiliary:—As under Nos. 1, 2, 3 or 4, with maximum of £50.
13. Places of entertainment attached to other licensed premises:—As under Nos. 1, 2, 3 or 4; or, alternatively, £50 for place of entertainment, plus duty under Nos. 1, 2, 3 or 4, based on apportioned value of rest of premises.

If premises are closed on Sundays or one hour earlier than otherwise required on week-days, the duty is six-sevenths of the foregoing amounts; in cases of both Sunday closing and early closing, the duty is five-sevenths.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

Frequently, we were told that "A drunken man is rarely seen in public in England today." The sharp, distinct curves in statistical data regarding temperance—such as the annual drink bill, the convictions for intoxication, the weeding out of superfluous public houses, and the consumption of intoxicants—indicated the assertion was correct. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake, we believe, to attribute the increase in sobriety over the last fifteen years to governmental regulation alone. We made constant inquiries into the reasons for the march of temperance.

One of the foremost economists in England, who had only a casual interest in the liquor problem, told us that high taxation, with consequent high prices, was not the major factor, although an important one. He explained that for several years taxation had stood at a peak where any returns from increased levies would

* A variety of native wines.

be offset by decreased sales. That situation had been unchanged, he said, during a period in which drinking had fallen off for other reasons, which were: Education, recreational facilities, housing improvements, outdoor and indoor sports, motion pictures and other amusements. The English today—and particularly the rising generation—wanted more pleasure for their shillings than they could get at a drinking bar.

We asked a distiller, who is known throughout the English-speaking world, why intoxication had decreased.

"There are several reasons," he replied, "I believe these ratios are approximately correct: 60 per cent due to high prices; 20 per cent to games, cinemas and public education; 15 per cent to automobiles and motor cycles, and 5 per cent to the radio."

Living Standards and Hours of Sale

While the economist and the distiller did not agree in their estimates of the importance of high duties, their opinions coincided to the extent that they both thought governmental restrictions and improved standards of living were just about equal factors. We found that police officers, government officials, dry extremists—in fact, observers of every sort—thought the steady advance of temperance was due very largely to changing standards of living.

That opinion was borne out by evidence relating to places which were lagging considerably behind the rest of England in respect of temperance. These localities, which have been indicated in a previous chapter dealing with compensation and intoxication records, are neither numerous nor typical, but they are significant, in our opinion, because they have a notably low rating in the scale of prosperity, education and physical environment.

Our inquiries in regard to the effect of hours of sale, as established, brought some conflicting replies. One theory was that early closing caused guzzling during the last quarter hour in public houses by customers who would otherwise drift out of their own accord without buying extra drinks. But most of the opinions we got were in favor of the limits now set. Our own observations convinced us that the licensing justices' regulations were both wise and salutary.

Campaigning by Prohibitionists

While prohibitionists in England acknowledge that temperance has been fast gaining ground since the World War, and is continuing to do

so, they are still zealous in their desire to absolutely abolish the use of intoxicants. The obstacles in their path are numerous and formidable. Not the least among them consists in reports of deplorable conditions to which prohibition has given rise in the United States. These reports include not only statistics and other official records, but oral testimony of English visitors to America, who have taken back accounts of their own experiences which amaze their compatriots at home.

Many dry organizations in England masquerade under a "Temperance" designation, and a number of the leading "pussyfoots," as they are often called, have gone on record with statements that the word prohibition should not be used. They have come out openly for the term Local Option. The "wets" have countered with broadcast warnings that "Local Option is only the entering wedge of Prohibition." They cite the record in the United States in support of their assertion, and remind voters that public apathy made Volsteadism possible in America. The dire failure of Local Option in Scotland, also, has been a thorn in the flesh for its advocates in England.

In political campaigns, the "drys" are unable to copy the tactics of their brethren in America. The English law limits the amount a candidate for Parliament may spend, by allowing so many pence per voter in each constituency. The candidate must render an accounting which covers his entire canvass, and expenditures by independent agencies in his behalf are chalked up against him. Consequently, speeches, posters and literature in the "temperance" cause carry appeals for Local Option, Sunday closing, and so on, but do not name the candidate or his party.

Even were Local Option, or prohibition, voted for in a general election, the verdict might be upset through the defeat of the government at the next election. England has no written Constitution in which an Eighteenth Amendment can find lodgment. And any new government coming into power may change a law.

Inquiry of the Liquor Commission

In 1928, the Labor Party declared in favor of a Royal Commission of inquiry into the liquor question. Although that question was not an issue in the general election in May, 1929, the victory of the Laborites was followed by the appointment of the Commission, in conformity to their pledge.

The inquiry has now been under way for

some time. It is expected to overhaul the entire licensing system and give particular attention to Local Option, the Carlisle Scheme, club regulations and a question of uniform hours of sale. Whether the findings will be handed up within the life of the present government cannot be foretold. The deliberations of the last previous liquor commission covered a period of three years (1896-1899). They resulted in the adoption of the Compensation Act of 1904.

SCOTLAND: LOCAL OPTION

Scotland has not made such progress toward temperance as have England and Wales, according to information we gathered, although even drys admitted that evil conditions of pre-war days had been much improved. Our survey there had to do chiefly with the operation of the Scottish Local Option law, which provides for the taking of polls on petition of 10 per cent of the electors not oftener than once in three years. The ballot presents three propositions, as follows:

1. No Change: continuance of the licensing system.
2. Limiting: reduction of licenses by one-quarter.
3. No License: no liquor sales except to lodgers or diners at hotels, inns or restaurants, none of which may have public bars.

That Local Option had proved a failure was admitted by drys themselves; wets pronounced it a fiasco. The returns had not only failed to bear out the drys' assertions in regard to a widespread demand for Prohibition, but had shown progressive defections in their ranks. There were 1,215 polling areas, of which 594 had voted, up to 1929. No Change had been voted in 537, and in the others (57) No License or Limiting had remained in force. Sixteen areas voted in 1929. Six continued No Change, four repealed Limitation, three repealed further Limitation, and three continued No License.

Statistical information covering conditions throughout Scotland was so meagre that no dependable conclusions could be drawn. Comprehensive police data showed a slight decline in the per capita rate for drunkenness in Edinburgh and Glasgow. The Scottish regulations governing clubs, while not satisfactory to the police, were more efficacious than those in England, owing to a system of yearly registration, with a right to refuse renewal for cause.

ULSTER AND THE FREE STATE

The internal conflict that resulted in the division of Ireland into two separate governments in Ulster and the Free State has left political issues in both commonwealths which overshadow the liquor question. There is very little statistical information in either of them, and new laws or regulations affecting temperance have not advanced beyond the stage of promise, rather than performance.

The Ulster government, which took office in 1922, passed a Licensing Act in 1923 drawn on the lines of the English Act. This measure restricted sales in public houses, abolished liquor sales in groceries, disqualified licensees after three convictions, and set up a Compensation Scheme for reduction of licenses.

The Irish Free State adopted an Intoxicating Liquor Act in 1924 and, on the subsequent findings of a government inquiry by a commission, amended the measure in 1927. The law, as it now stands, parallels the English Act, with minor variations. We were impressed by the following clause in the report of the Free State Commission:

> In the first place we desire emphatically to point out that temperance legislation has succeeded in the past only so far as the willingness of the community involved has permitted it to succeed. The essential functions of the law are to preserve order, maintain justice, and protect the community. It is not the function of the law to make people good. Whenever it tries to do so without general public support it fails.

Both Ulster and the Free State, we found, were heavily over-licensed. Their Compensation plans for eliminating public houses had not materially relieved that condition, largely on account of economic conditions bearing on the amount of funds obtainable through taxation or otherwise.

TABLE I

Britain's Annual Drink Bill

(As computed by England's Foremost Prohibition Organization, The United Kingdom Alliance)

Year	Estimated Expenditure (Revised)	Per Capita			Per capita (in dollars)
1914	£164,463,000	£ 3	10	10	$17.03
1915	181,959,000	3	18	11	19.18
1916	204,000,000	4	8	8	21.57
1917	259,000,000	5	12	0	27.25
1918	259,300,000	5	13	0	27.49
1919	386,600,000	8	8	0	40.87
1920	469,700,000	10	0	0	48.67
1921	403,000,000	8	10	0	41.36
1922	354,000,000	7	9	0	36.26
*1923	307,500,000	7	2	0	34.56
1924	316,000,000	7	5	0	35.29
1925	315,000,000	7	4	0	35.04
1926	301,300,000	6	17	0	33.33
1927	298,800,000	6	15	3	32.92
1928	288,200,000	6	9	10	31.59

* Irish Free State excluded after 1922.

TABLE II

Total and Per Capita Consumption of Liquor

(As computed by England's Foremost Prohibition Organization, The United Kingdom Alliance)

Year Ending 31st Dec.	000's omitted			Per Capita (Imperial Gallons)		
	Beer (Barrels) "Standard"	Spirits (Imperial Gals.)	Wine (Imperial Gals.)	Beer (Standard)	Spirits	Wine
1910.....	32,830	29,270	12,670	26.31	0.65	0.28
1911.....	34,250	30,690	11,220	27.20	0.68	0.25
1912.....	33,910	30,530	11,230	26.83	0.67	0.25
1913.....	35,250	31,790	11,370	27.76	0.70	0.25
1914.....	34,130	31,660	10,630	26.66	0.69	0.23
1915.....	29,130	35,000	10,170	22.77	0.76	0.22
1916.....	26,670	28,140	9,910	20.84	0.61	0.22
1917.....	16,130	18,530	7,100	12.60	0.41	0.15
1918.....	12,790	15,110	11,320	9.99	0.33	0.25
1919.....	21,750	21,720	19,230	16.99	0.47	0.41
1920.....	26,917	22,148	15,156	20.61	0.47	0.32
1921.....	24,368	18,584	11,242	18.56	0.39	0.24
1922.....	20,933	16,950	12,594	15.80	0.36	0.26
*1923.....	20,510	14,315	13,000	17.04	0.33	0.30
1924.....	21,750	14,337	15,162	17.96	0.33	0.35
1925.....	21,858	14,010	15,840	17.97	0.32	0.36
1926.....	20,978	12,869	16,492	17.17	0.29	0.375
1927.....	20,819	12,881	16,628	16.96	0.29	0.375

*Irish Free State excluded after 1922.

NOTE—An Imperial gallon equals 1.20094 American gallons.

TABLE III

Reduction of On-Licenses (for Open Bars)

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

Year	Number Of On-Licenses	Proportion per 10,000 of Population	Decrease during Preceding Period	
			Number	Percentage
1895	103,341	33.94	.....	.....
1900	102,189	31.69	*230	*.22
1905	99,478	29.27	*542	*.53
1910	92,484	25.84	*1,399	*1.41
1915	86,626	23.22	*1,172	*1.27
1916	85,889	23.02	737	.85
1917	85,273	22.86	616	.72
1918	84,644	22.69	629	.74
1919	84,038	23.29	606	.72
1924	80,987	20.90	*610	*.73
1925	80,420	20.68	567	.70
1926	79,860	20.44	560	.70
1927	79,330	20.19	530	.67
1928	78,803	19.96	527	.66

* Annual averages, respectively, for 1895-1900, 1900-1905, 1905-1910, 1910-1915 and 1919-1924.

TABLE IV

Off-Licenses (to Sell Liquor to be Drunk Off the Premises)

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

Year	Number of Off-Licenses	Proportion per 10,000 of Population	Decrease of Off-Licenses during Preceding Period	
			Number	Percentage
1905	25,405	7.47	.....	.....
1910	24,438	6.83	†193	†.76
1915	23,202	6.22	†247	†1.01
1916	22,977	6.16	225	.97
1917	22,719	6.09	258	1.12
1918	22,473	6.03	246	1.08
1919	22,288	6.19	185	.82
1924	22,135	5.71	†31	†.14
1925	22,131	5.69	4	.02
1926	22,149	5.67	*18	*.08
1927	22,174	5.64	*25	*.11
1928	22,189	5.62	*15	*.07

* Increase.

† Annual averages, respectively, for 1905-1910, 1910-1915 and 1919-1924.

TABLE V

Number of "Pubs" in Relation to Drunkenness—by County Boroughs

(NOTE: The following table has been compiled from the complete official list of eighty-four county boroughs. For purposes of illustration, every fifth borough in the list which has been graduated upward according to the number of on-licenses per 10,000 population, is taken, and there are also given various important cities which would not be represented in that plan of selection.)

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

	County Borough	Per 10,000 Population		
		On-Licenses	On- plus Off-Licenses	Intoxication Convictions
5	Southport	6.05	11.98	4.79
10	Middlesbrough	7.97	13.21	69.25
15	Cardiff	10.22	12.86	5.68
	Carlisle	10.46	11.17	10.64
20	Leeds	11.46	19.56	10.30
	South Shields	11.66	19.13	29.31
	Birmingham	11.67	19.19	26.08
	London (County)	12.01	16.50	45.05
25	Warrington	12.49	21.36	11.49
	Newcastle-on-Tyne	13.43	19.31	33.06
30	Barrow-in-Furness	13.50	22.90	11.53
	Salford	14.78	31.01	38.47
35	Liverpool	15.68	17.08	29.09
	Sheffield	15.97	28.44	5.06
	Nottingham	16.20	31.43	7.20
40	Bradford	16.50	32.65	12.96
45	Manchester	17.83	26.93	32.50
	Bristol	19.20	27.26	7.06
50	Huddersfield	19.38	24.51	5.66
	Plymouth	19.48	23.12	1.44
	Tynemouth	20.29	26.96	15.14
55	Dewsbury	20.70	31.81	5.65
60	York	21.44	32.79	11.70
65	Stoke-on-Trent	22.92	30.78	3.68
	Southampton	23.13	28.72	9.42
	Portsmouth	23.59	31.02	13.79
70	Rochdale	24.14	34.61	5.29
75	Oxford	26.97	35.36	5.92
	Burton-on-Trent	30.23	47.79	22.26
80	Chester	34.29	40.66	12.25
	Canterbury	46.10	53.16	4.57
85	London (City)	302.31	416.74	222.89

TABLE VI

Number of "Pubs" in Relation to Drunkenness—by Counties

(Note:—Counties are listed in order of number of on-licenses on an upward scale.)
(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

County (Excluding County Boroughs)	Per 10,000 Population		Intoxication Convictions
	On-Licenses	On- plus Off-Licenses	
Middlesex	7.50	11.72	9.92
Glamorgan	13.11	15.06	10.22
Northumberland	14.41	17.24	19.99
Surrey	14.93	20.28	5.28
Essex	15.25	19.40	5.48
Durham	16.73	20.57	14.07
Lancaster	17.56	22.93	5.90
Nottingham	17.72	23.42	2.41
Cornwall	18.81	20.79	3.24
York	20.14	25.60	13.46
Merioneth	20.68	21.36	7.05
Chester	20.73	25.58	3.26
Anglesey	21.23	22.20	6.23
Caernarvon	21.55	24.05	7.75
Monmouth	22.20	24.47	2.93
Derby	23.25	30.06	6.72
Kent	24.40	29.53	4.49
Sussex	24.56	31.33	2.59
Warwick	24.69	30.77	8.50
Denbigh	26.56	28.68	5.25
Leicester	27.05	34.93	3.80
Southampton	27.50	33.06	3.06
Wilts	29.01	34.27	1.87
Devon	29.56	33.06	4.79
Dorset	30.08	34.13	4.17
Stafford	30.47	35.90	6.79
Northampton	30.77	41.47	2.93
Flint	31.09	33.24	3.59
Lincoln	31.99	36.05	11.55
Hertford	32.68	37.10	5.63
Somerset	32.72	36.96	3.11
Worcester	33.01	38.77	4.07
Carmarthen	33.26	35.59	19.60
Westmorland	33.42	37.40	5.09
Gloucester	34.92	40.99	1.56
Montgomery	35.52	37.48	13.34
Cardigan	35.68	38.35	6.60
Suffolk	35.75	40.65	2.53
Cumberland	35.90	38.41	5.98
Bedford	36.39	41.49	4.87
Radnor	37.41	39.23	3.65
Pembroke	38.14	40.18	18.96
Salop	38.29	42.46	5.24
Hereford	40.71	45.80	5.18
Buckingham	41.84	46.30	4.15
Berks	42.49	47.89	6.75
Norfolk	45.48	48.67	2.98
Brecon	49.52	52.67	6.48
Cambridge	51.73	55.61	2.37
Oxford	55.73	61.39	2.03
Rutland	57.91	67.37	2.23
Huntingdon	62.50	68.36	6.21

TABLE VII

Compensation Funds (1905-1928)

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)
(Shillings and pence omitted)

Period or Year	Total Amount Received into Compensation Funds	Average Amount of Compensation Paid per License		
		Full Licenses	Beerhouse Licenses	All Licenses
1905–09	£ 5,489,214	£ 958	£ 838	£ 881
1910–14	4,408,808	958	933	958
1915	308,186	1,095	1,123	1,111
1916	568,480	1,154	1,003	1,070
1917	442,788	1,248	1,171	1,206
1918	618,695	1,343	1,157	1,245
1919–23	3,878,866	1,595	1,548	1,569
1924	1,023,724	1,846	1,732	1,789
1925	861,446	1,612	1,762	1,688
1926	695,944	1,887	1,797	1,839
1927	821,819	1,983	1,802	1,886
1928	728,816	1,772	1,927	1,847
Total	£19,846,786			

TABLE VII-A

Compensation Funds (1905-1928)

(This table lists in American dollars the amounts given in Table VII.)

Year	Total Amount Received into Compensation Funds	Average Amount of Compensation Paid per License		
		Full License	Beer-house Licenses	All Licenses
1905–09	$26,713,260	$4,662	$4,078	$4,287
1910–14	21,455,464	4,662	4,540	4,662
1915	1,499,787	5,329	5,465	5,407
1916	2,766,508	5,616	4,881	5,207
1917	2,154,828	6,073	5,699	5,869
1918	3,010,879	6,536	5,631	6,059
1919–23	18,876,501	7,762	7,533	7,636
1924	4,981,953	8,984	8,429	8,706
1925	4,192,227	7,845	8,575	8,215
1926	3,386,812	9,183	8,745	8,949
1927	3,999,382	9,650	8,769	9,178
1928	3,546,783	8,623	9,378	8,988

TABLE VIII
Weeding Out of Licenses Under Compensation Act

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

Period or Year	Licensed Premises Closed				New Licenses Granted	Net Decrease in each Period or Year
	Renewals Refused		Licenses Lapsed From Various Causes	Total		
	With Compensation	Without Compensation				
1905-09.....	1,069**	52**	332**	1,454**	55**	1,399**
1910-14.....	901**	20**	30**	1,218**	46**	1,172**
1915.....	574	11	177	762	25	737
1916.....	383	22	239	644	28	616
1917.....	353	34	271	658	29	629
1918.....	400	19	201	620	14	606
1919-23.....	471**	16**	209**	697**	87**	610**
1924.....	486	9	181	676	109	567
1925.....	427	10	279	716	156	560
1926.....	457	6	236	699	169	530
1927.....	437	9	234	680	153	527
1928.....	397	3	222*	622*	152	470*
Total....	16,124†	569	6,224	22,917	1,772	21,145

* Provisional figures.
† Including 66 cases in which compensation was waived.
** Average annual increase.

TABLE IX

Instances of How Compensation Levies Vary

(Compiled from Licensing Statistics, 1927)

County and Borough, or Petty Sess. Div.	On-licensed Premises	Drunks Con-victed	Popu-lation	Com-pensation Levy
Durham				
Darlington..	66	78	65,842	None
Gateshead...	127	401	125,142	Max.
South Shields	142	357	118,599	¼ Max.
Sunderland..	248	179	159,055	Max.
West Hartle-pool.....	73	102	68,641	½ Max.
Essex (*a*)				
East Ham...	35	223	143,246	None
Southend-on-Sea.....	56	59	106,010	None
West Ham...	184	463	300,860	Max.
Kent (*a*)				
E. & W. Divisions..	2,792	517	431,039	None
Canterbury..	111	11	23,737	Max.
Lancaster				
Barrow-in-Furness...	89	76	74,244	¾ Max.
Preston.....	277	57	117,406	Max.
Blackpool...	98	183	99,639	None
Blackburn...	266	70	126,922	Max.
Bolton.....	332	139	178,683	Max.
Burnley.....	148	45	103,157	None
Bury.....	135	32	56,403	Max.
Manchester..	1,344	2,457	730,307	Max.
Oldham.....	299	222	144,983	Max.
Rochdale....	217	48	90,816	Max.
Salford.....	357	929	234,045	Max.
Bootle.....	51	148	76,487	Max.
Liverpool....	1,367	2,539	802,940	Max.
St. Helens...	167	68	102,640	Max.
Southport...	48	38	76,621	¼ Max.
Warrington..	100	92	76,811	Max.
Wigan.....	176	95	89,421	Max.
Northampton				
Northampton	203	44	90,895	Max.
Liberty of Peter-borough...	142	28	46,959	Max.
Rest of county....	674	50	211,509	None
Northumberland				
Newcastle-upon-Tyne	379	933	275,009	Max.
Tynemouth..	134	100	63,770	Max.
Rest of county....	587	814	407,317	None
Southampton				
Portsmouth..	603	356	247,284	Max.
Bournemouth	48	28	91,761	None
Southampton	393	160	160,994	Max.
Rest of Hampshire	1,217	150	410,231	None

(*a*) Parts of Essex and Kent are in the Metropolitan (London) Police District.

TABLE X

Increase in Registered Clubs

(From Licensing Statistics, 1928)

Year	Number of Registered Clubs	Proportion per 10,000 of Population	Increase (or Decrease) of Clubs during preceding period	
			Number	Percentage
1904	6,371	1.89	.....	.....
1905	6,589	1.94	218	3.42
1910	7,536	2.11	*189	*2.87
1915	8,902	2.39	*273	*.36
1916	8,520	2.28	—382	—4.29
1917	8,167	2.19	—353	—4.15
1918	7,972	2.14	—195	—2.39
1919	8,049	2.24	77	.97
1924	11,471	2.96	*684	*8.50
1925	11,780	3.03	309	2.69
1926	12,138	3.11	358	2.95
1927	12,481	3.18	343	2.83
1928	12,775	3.24	294	2.36

*Annual average increases, respectively, for 1905-1910, 1910-1915 and 1919-1924.

TABLE XI

Percentage of Taxes Derived from Liquor

(From Alliance Year Book and Statistical Abstract of the United Kingdom, Various Issues)

Year	United Kingdom Net Receipts of Customs & Excise for Beer, Spirits, Wines, Licenses, Monopoly Value & Club Duties	Total Exchequer Receipts Tax Revenue	Percentage of Net Receipts from Trade to Total Tax Revenue
	£	£	
1900	41,669,109	99,633,000	41.8
1910	33,748,925	105,230,000	32.1
1911	43,983,250	175,162,000	25.1
1912	41,826,977	155,040,000	27.0
1913	41,518,875	154,753,000	26.8
1914	43,298,861	163,029,000	26.6
1915	46,484,759	189,305,000	24.6
1916	65,133,298	290,088,000	22.5
1917	53,976,375	514,105,000	10.5
1918	32,915,257	613,040,000	5.4
1919	52,348,079	784,278,000	6.7
1920	133,808,007	998,960,000	13.4
1921	201,267,916	1,031,725,000	19.5
1922	191,999,839	856,713,000	22.4
1923	160,950,663	774,738,000	20.8
*1924	143,406,167	718,060,000	20.0
1925	141,450,074	689,702,000	20.5
1926	140,626,841	684,544,000	20.5
1927	136,575,259	663,933,000	20.6
1928	139,577,268	693,421,000	20.1

* Irish Free State excluded after 1923.

TABLE XI-A

Percentage of Taxes Derived from Liquor

(This table lists in American dollars the amounts given in Table XI and also shows per capita receipts from the liquor trade.)

Year	United Kingdom Net Receipts of Customs & Excise for Beer, Spirits, Wines, Licenses, Monopoly Value & Club Duties		Total Exchequer Receipts Tax Revenues
	Total	Per Capita	
1900	$202,782,719	$ 4.93	$484,863,995
1910	164,239,144	3.66	512,101,795
1911	214,044,486	4.72	852,425,873
1912	203,550,984	4.48	754,502,160
1913	202,051,605	4.43	753,105,475
1914	210,713,907	4.58	793,380,629
1915	226,218,080	5.10	921,252,783
1916	316,971,195	7.25	1,411,713,252
1917	262,676,029	6.07	2,501,891,983
1918	160,182,098	3.72	2,983,359,160
1919	254,751,927	5.71	3,816,688,887
1920	651,176,035	14.01	4,861,438,840
1921	979,469,458	20.79	5,020,889,713
1922	934,367,083	19.67	4,169,193,815
1923	783,266,227	17.58	3,770,262,477
1924	697,885,813	15.55	3,494,438,900
1925	688,366,360	15.28	3,356,434,783
1926	684,360,093	15.13	3,331,333,376
1927	664,643,261	14.65	3,231,029,945
1928	679,252,261	14.93	3,374,533,297

TABLE XII

Liquor Revenues Compared With Other Receipts (1927-28)

(From Report of Commissioners of Customs and Excise, 1928)

	£	$
Motor Vehicles, etc., duties	24,518,000	119,316,847
Estate, etc., duties	77,310,000	376,229,115
Stamps (exclusive of Fees, etc., stamps)	27,030,000	131,541,495
Land tax, house duty and mineral rights duty	780,000	3,795,870
Super tax	60,600,000	294,909,900
Excess profits duty, etc.	nil	.....
Corporation profits tax	1,780,000	8,662,370
Post office (including telephone and telegraph)	63,000,000	306,589,500
Crown lands (net)	1,070,000	5,207,155
Miscellaneous (including fee, etc., stamps)	61,380,958	298,710,432
LIQUOR REVENUES	139,577,268	679,252,775

NOTE: These are amounts actually received into the Exchequer. The total revenue was somewhat larger in some instances, and less in others, but the deductions and the additions strike a balance.

TABLE XIII

Liquor Revenues in Relation to Other Disbursements

(From Report of Commissioners of Customs and Excise, 1928)

(NOTE: The liquor traffic in 1927-28 yielded £139,577,268 for the Exchequer, which paid out the following sums as listed in Finance Accounts.)

(Shillings and pence omitted)

	£	£	($)
For national debt services:			
Interest	312,008,581		
Management and expenses	1,807,705		
New sinking fund	65,000,000		
Total		378,816,287	1,843,509,471
For annuities and pensions		387,799	1,887,224
For inland revenue and customs and excise service		11,745,000	57,157,043
For post office		56,800,000	276,474,357
For national defense services:			
Army	44,150,000		
Navy	58,140,000		
Air	15,150,000		
Total		117,440,000	571,521,760
For courts of justice		471,842	2,359,210

TABLE XIV

Net Receipts of Customs and Excise

(From Alliance Year Book, 1929)

Year ending 31 March	000 omitted				Monopoly Value	Club Duty	(000 omitted) Total
	Beer	Spirits	Wine	Liquor Licenses			
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1918....	19,109	10,596	781	2,306	18,432	102,462	32,913
1919....	25,424	24,242	1,409	1,141	16,957	112,670	52,346
1920....	71,278	58,803	2,236	1,216	31,110	244,259	133,808
1921....	123,406	71,035	2,913	3,486	48,868	379,857	201,268
1922....	121,865	62,819	2,751	4,152	35,458	378,018	192,000
1923....	100,035	53,704	3,033	3,923	41,762	313,334	161,051
*1924....	81,702	54,037	3,369	4,074	62,159	162,888	143,406
1925....	81,987	51,054	3,752	4,418	69,798	169,576	141,450
1926....	82,403	49,928	3,746	4,312	70,146	168,233	140,627
1927....	84,196	43,553	4,329	4,246	84,250	166,606	136,575
1928....	83,319	47,368	4,267	4,345	109,795	169,173	139,578

* Irish Free State excluded after 1922-23.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

Whereas, the Constitution of the United States, as established by the Fathers, delegated to the Federal Government only such powers as in their very nature should be Federal and not State, and under that distribution of powers our country enjoyed progress and stability for a hundred and thirty years; and

Whereas, the Eighteenth Amendment is misplaced in the Federal Constitution in violation of the fundamental American right of local self-government in local affairs, and in surrender to the Federal authorities of police duties over the habits and the conduct of individuals which belong of right to the States; and

Whereas, National Prohibition under this Amendment has been the source of intolerable wrongs, having undermined our Federal system of government, robbed our citizens of Constitutional rights, fostered excessive drinking of strong intoxicants, bred corruption and hypocrisy, caused ruthless killings of men, women and children, sown disrespect for law and order, and flooded our country with untaxed and illicit liquor; therefore be it

Resolved, that the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment demands redress of these wrongs through restoration to the several States of the right of their peoples to enact such liquor laws as they may respectively choose, the abolition of the old-time saloon having paved the way for sound and enlightened legislation by them for the control, or, if they wish, for the prohibition of the liquor trade, provided that such legislation shall not conflict with the duty of the Federal Government to protect each State against violation of its laws by citizens of other States; and be it therefore further

Resolved, that the Eighteenth Amendment must be Repealed.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

September 1, 1930

W. H. STAYTON, Chairman
Washington

MATHER A. ABBOTT, Lawrenceville, New Jersey. *Head Master of the Lawrenceville School.*
GEORGE ADE, Hazelden Farm, Brook, Indiana. *Author.*
R. L. AGASSIZ, 12 Ashburton Place, Boston, Massachusetts. *Chairman of the Board, Calumet and Hecla Consolidated Copper Co.*
A. L. AGATIN, 802 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minnesota. *Lawyer.*
FREDERICK M. ALGER, Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan.
FREDERICK H. ALLEN, 2 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y. *International Lawyer, practising in New York and Europe; attached to Commission to negotiate peace in Paris in 1919.*
FREDERIC WINTHROP ALLEN, 37 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Lee Higginson and Co., Bankers.*
JOHANNES ANDERSEN, 21 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y. *Merchant, Importer and Manufacturer of Pulp and Paper.*
WILLIAM S. ANDREWS, 312 S. A. & K. Building, Syracuse, New York. *Late Judge, Court of Appeals of New York.*
H. M. ATKINSON, Electric & Gas Building, Atlanta, Georgia. *Financier.*
GENERAL W. W. ATTERBURY, Broad Street Station Building, 1617 Pennsylvania Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

JOHN E. BACON, M.D., Miami Inspiration Hospital, Miami, Arizona. *Chief Surgeon.*
THOMAS BARBOUR, Cambridge, Massachusetts. *Professor of Zoology and Director of Harvard University Museum.*
JOHN BARNES, Amsterdam, New York. *President, Blood Knitting Company.*
JAMES S. BARRON, Norfolk, Virginia. *Lawyer; State Senator.*
G. D'ANDELOT BELIN, Scranton, Pennsylvania. *President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Company of Pennsylvania.*
S. R. BERTRON, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *Banker.*
W. G. BESLER, 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y. *Chairman of the Board, The Central R. R. Co. of New Jersey.*
JAMES G. BLAINE, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *President, Fidelity Trust Company of New York.*
PIERCE BLEWETT, Jamestown, North Dakota. *Farmer.*
G. ALDER BLUMER, M.D., 196 Blackstone Boulevard, Providence, Rhode Island. *Chairman, Rhode Island Division, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*
W. E. BOEING, Georgetown Station, Seattle. Washington. *Chairman of the Board, United Aircraft and Transport Corporation.*
HARLOW BROOKS, M.D., 47 West Ninth Street, New York, N. Y. *Consulting Physician.*
FRANK C. BROPHY, 514 Heard Building, Phoenix, Arizona. *Chairman, Arizona Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*
JAMES B. BROWN, Louisville, Kentucky. *President, National Bank of Kentucky.*
SAMUEL A. BROWN, M.D., 75 East 55th Street, New York, N. Y. *Consulting Physician.*
MATTHEW C. BRUSH, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *President, American International Corporation.*
WALTER H. BUCK, Union Trust Building, Baltimore, Maryland. *Lawyer; Chairman, Maryland Division, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*
J. LEWIS BUMGARDNER, Beckley, West Virginia. *Lawyer.*
CHARLES W. BUNN, Northern Pacific Railway Company, St. Paul, Minnesota. *Lawyer.*
STRUTHERS BURT, Bar B. C. Ranch, Moose P. O., Jackson Hole, Wyoming. *Author.*
S. P. BUSH, 20 South Third Street, Columbus, Ohio. *Retired Industrialist.*

DONALD A. CALLAHAN, Wallace, Idaho. *Lawyer.*
J. DAWSON CALLERY, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Banker; President, Diamond National Bank.*
OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. *Professor of English.*
GEORGE H. CAPEN, Pierce Building, St. Louis, Missouri.
W. FRANK CARTER, 418 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri. *Lawyer.*
ROBERT K. CASSATT, Commercial Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Partner, Cassatt & Company, Bankers.*
SAMUEL HARDEN CHURCH, 4781 Wallingford Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *President, Carnegie Institute.*
EMORY W. CLARK, 8310 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Michigan. *Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Detroit.*
H. A. CLARK, Warren, Arizona. *Manager, Calumet and Arizona Mining Company.*
HERBERT L. CLARK, Locust at 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Partner, E. W. Clark and Co., Bankers.*

JULIAN CODMAN, 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer.*

WALTER B. COFFEY, M.D., San Francisco, California. *Head of the Hospital Service of the Southern Pacific Railroad Company.*

B. DAWSON COLEMAN, Lebanon, Pennsylvania. *Banker.*

WARREN COLEMAN, M.D., 59 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y. *Consulting Physician to Bellevue Hospital.*

JAMES FENIMORE COOPER, 35 State Street, Albany, New York. *Attorney-at-Law.*

W. R. C. CORSON, 127 Oxford Street, Hartford, Connecticut. *President and Treasurer, Hartford Steam Boiler, Inspection & Insurance Co.*

FREDERIC R. COUDERT, 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y. *Member of the New York Bar.*

R. T. CRANE, JR., 836 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois. *President, The Crane Co.*

BENEDICT CROWELL, 930 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio. *Chairman of the Board, Crowell & Little Construction Co.; Assistant Secretary of War during World War.*

HENRY H. CURRAN, 21 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y. *President, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*

RICHARD H. DABNEY, University of Virginia, University, Virginia. *Author; Professor of History; formerly Professor of Economics.*

JAMES M. DAIN, 260 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minnesota. *Investment Banker.*

CHARLES L. DANA, M.D., 53 West 53rd Street, New York, N. Y. *Trustee and former President, New York Academy of Medicine.*

MILTON DARGAN, Hart Building, Atlanta, Georgia. *Insurance.*

BENJAMIN S. DEAN, Fenton Building, Jamestown, New York. *Counselor-at-Law.*

JOHN B. DEAVER, M.D., 1830 De Lancey Place, Philadelphia. Pennsylvania. *Surgeon.*

HENRY W. DE FOREST, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Lawyer; Chairman of the Executive Committee, Southern Pacific Co.*

WILLIAM DE KRAFT, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

LYMAN DELANO, Wilmington, North Carolina. *Executive Vice-President, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co.*

A. C. DEUEL, Niagara Falls, New York. *President and General Manager, Niagara Falls Gazette.*

BENJAMIN H. DIBBLEE, Russ Building, San Francisco, California. *Vice President and Director, E. H. Rollins & Sons.*

JOSEPH DILWORTH, 4th and Bingham Streets, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Vice President and Treasurer, Pittsburgh Parking Garages, Inc.*

HENRY W. DOOLEY, San Juan, P. R. *Chairman, Woodrow Wilson Foundation.*

CHARLES DORRANCE, 626 Scranton Life Insurance Building, Scranton, Pennsylvania. *Consulting Mining Engineer.*

F. J. DOUGLAS, M.D., 285 Genesee Street, Utica, New York. *Surgeon.*

WALTER DOUGLAS, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *President, Phelps Dodge Corporation.*

IRÉNÉE DU PONT, Wilmington, Delaware. *Chairman of the Finance Committee, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*

LAMMOT DU PONT, Wilmington, Delaware. *President, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*

PIERRE S. DU PONT, Wilmington, Delaware. *Chairman of the Board, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*

FLETCHER M. DURBIN, 111 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois. *Investments.*

A. J. DYER, Nashville, Tennessee. *President, Nashville Bridge Company.*

ISAAC W. DYER, 85 Exchange Street, Portland, Maine. *Lawyer; former United States Attorney for Maine,*

STERLING E. EDMUNDS, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Missouri. *Lawyer.*

SIDNEY M. EHRMAN, Nevada Bank Building, San Francisco, California. *Lawyer.*

WILLIAM M. ELKINS, 1233 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Partner, Elkins, Morris & Co., Bankers.*

A. C. ELLIS, Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. *Member of the firm, Dickson, Ellis, Parsons & McCrea, Attorneys-at-Law*

CASWELL P. ELLIS, JR., 905 Hibernia Bank Building, New Orleans, Louisiana. *Cotton Commission Merchant; Dealer in stocks and bonds.*

NATHANIEL A. ELSBERG, 141 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

W. L. R. EMMET, General Electric Company, 1 River Road, Schenectady, New York. *Electrical Engineer.*

WILLIAM P. ENO, 1771 N Street, Washington, D. C. *Highway Traffic Regulation Engineer.*

MARION EPPLEY, The Eppley Research Laboratory, Beacon Rock, Newport, Rhode Island. *Physicist.*

JOHN ERSKINE, 49 East 52nd Street, New York, N. Y. *Professor of English, Columbia University.*

MILTON H. ESBERG, 601 Third Street, San Francisco, California. *Mercantile Executive.*

JAMES EWING, M.D., Cornell University Medical College, First Avenue and 28th Street, New York, N. Y. *Pathologist.*

GEORGE R. FEARING, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Member of the firm, Jackson & Curtis, Brokers.*
STANLEY FIELD, 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois. *Director, Marshall Field & Co.; President, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois.*
THOMAS W. FINUCANE, 183 East Main Street, Rochester, New York. *Capitalist.*
FREDERICK P. FISH, 84 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer; former President, American Telephone and Telegraph Co.*
FRED J. FISHER, Cass and Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan. *Vice President, General Motors Corporation.*
GEORGE P. FISKE, San Antonio, Texas. *Retired.*
MITCHELL D. FOLLANSBEE, 137 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois. *Partner, Follansbee, Shorey & Schupp, Lawyers.*
TOD FORD, Pasadena, California. *Attorney-at-Law.*
HENRY F. FORTMAN, 465 California Street, San Francisco, California. *Retired.*
FABIAN FRANKLIN, 417 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. *Journalist, Author and Mathematician.*
P. A. S. FRANKLIN, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
GEORGE HARRISON FRAZIER, 1016 Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
WILLIAM FREW, Union Trust Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Banker.*
HAROLD DEWOLF FULLER, 32 Washington Place, New York, N. Y. *Editor and Teacher.*

WILLIAM GAMMELL, 50 S. Main Street, Providence, Rhode Island. *Partner, Brown & Ives, Bankers.*
IRVIN McD. GARFIELD, 30 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Member of firm, Warren, Garfield, Whiteside & Lamson, Lawyers.*
CLARENCE H. GEIST, Packard Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *President, The C. H. Geist Co.*
ROBERT GLENDINNING, 15th and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Banker.*
DAVID M. GOODRICH, 17 East 42nd Street, New York, N. Y. *Director, The B. F. Goodrich Co.*
ANSON C. GOODYEAR, 1104 Marine Trust Building, Buffalo, New York. *President, Great Southern Lumber Co.*

BRUCE HALDEMAN, Glenview, Kentucky. *Retired Publicist.*
ARTHUR F. HALL, The Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., Fort Wayne, Indiana.
CHARLES H. HAMILL, 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois. *Lawyer.*
JAMES C. HAMLEN, Portland, Maine. *President, J. H. Hamlen & Son, Inc., Lumber Manufacturers and Timber Land Owners.*
JOSEPH R. HAMLEN, 111 Devonshire Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Director for New England, Rudolph Guenther-Russell Law, Inc., Financial Advertising; President, Harvard Alumni Bulletin; Chairman, Harvard Fund Council.*
EDWARD S. HARKNESS, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. *Philanthropist; Director, New York Central Railroad and Southern Pacific Co.*
E. ROLAND HARRIMAN, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, W. A. Harriman & Co., Bankers.*
CHARLES HAYDEN, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Hayden, Stone & Co., Bankers.*
AUGUSTINE HEALY, Southern Pines, North Carolina.
BURT W. HENRY, Canal Bank Building, New Orleans, Louisiana. *Partner, Henry and Cooper, Lawyers,*
GENERAL WILLIAM C. HEPPENHEIMER, 35 Journal Square, Jersey City, New Jersey. *Chairman of Board, The Trust Company of New Jersey.*
ERSKINE HEWITT, Ringwood Manor, Passaic County, New Jersey. *Lawyer.*
H. L. HOLDEN, JR., Easton, Maryland. *Farmer.*
HENRY HORNBLOWER, 60 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Banker.*
FRANK S. HOWLAND, Athens, New York.
ELTON HOYT, II, Union Trust Building, Cleveland, Ohio. *Partner, Pickands, Mather & Co.*
GERALD HUGHES, International Trust Building, Denver, Colorado. *Lawyer; Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Denver.*
HUGH HUME, The Spectator, Portland, Oregon. *Editor.*

WILLIAM M. INGRAHAM, Clapp Memorial Building, Portland, Maine. *Lawyer; former Assistant Secretary of War.*
JAMES IRVINE, Crocker Building, San Francisco, California. *Agriculturist.*
JOSEPH N. IVEY, Suite 1309 Hoge Building, Seattle, Washington. *Lawyer.*

DANIEL C. JACKLING, Hobart Building, San Francisco, California. *Engineer and Industrial Executive.*
MALCOLM JACKSON, 30 Bradford Street, Charleston, West Virginia. *Lawyer, Retired.*

ARTHUR CURTISS JAMES, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, Phelps Dodge Corporation.*

OLIVER G. JENNINGS, Fairfield, Connecticut. *Capitalist.*

HENRY W. JESSUP, The Bar Building, 36 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y. *Counselor-at-Law.*

ELDRIDGE R. JOHNSON, Camden, New Jersey. *Former President, Victor Talking Machine Co.*

HENRY B. JOY, Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan. *Former President, Packard Motor Car Co.*

CORNELIUS F. KELLEY, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Lawyer; President, Anaconda Copper Mining Company.*

J. MILLER KENYON, Evans Building, Washington, D. C. *Attorney and Counselor-at-Law.*

C. J. KEYSER, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. *Adrain Professor Emeritus of Mathematics, Columbia University.*

F. M. KIRBY, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. *Vice President, Woolworth Co.*

JOHN H. KIRBY, Houston, Texas. *President, Kirby Lumber Co.*

ARNOLD H. KNAPP, M.D., 10 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y. *Executive Surgeon, Herman Knapp Memorial Eye Hospital.*

WILLIAM S. KNUDSEN, General Motors Building, Detroit, Michigan. *President and General Manager, Chevrolet Motor Company.*

FREDERICK J. KOSTER, Room 1414 Shell Building, 100 Bush Street, San Francisco, California. *President, California Barrel Company.*

SAMUEL W. LAMBERT, M.D., 128 East 75th Street, New York, N. Y. *Former Dean, College of Physicians and Surgeons; Former President, New York Academy of Medicine.*

ARTHUR W. LAWRENCE, 4 Valley Road, Bronxville, New York. *Investments.*

J. C. LeBOURGEOIS, 405 New Orleans Bank Building, New Orleans, Louisiana. *President, LeBourgeois Brokerage Co., Inc.*

ALEXANDER LINCOLN, 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer; Former Assistant Attorney-General, Massachusetts.*

HENRY F. LIPPITT, Providence, Rhode Island. *Chairman of the Board, Manville Jenckes Company.*

THOMAS B. LOCKWOOD, 512 Manufacturers & Traders Building, Buffalo, New York.

ARTHUR LYMAN, 60 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Trustee; President, Merrimack Manufacturing Company; Director, Old Colony Trust Company.*

ARTHUR W. MACHEN, JR., Calvert Building, Baltimore, Maryland. *Lawyer.*

NORMAN E. MACK, 1106 Rand Building, Buffalo, New York. *Editor and Publisher.*

F. W. MACLENNAN, Miami, Arizona. *General Manager, Miami Copper Company.*

ROGERS MacVEAGH, Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon. *Lawyer.*

WALTER B. MAHONY, 9 East 37th Street, New York, N. Y. *Editor, North American Review; Director, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company.*

SEVERO MALLET-PREVOST, 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt and Mosle, Lawyers.*

GEORGE D. MARKHAM, 16th Floor Railway Exchange, St. Louis, Missouri. *Senior Partner of W. H. Markham & Co., Insurance.*

FREDERICK ROY MARTIN, Lawrence Park West, Bronxville, N. Y. *Journalist and Publisher; formerly General Manager, The Associated Press.*

NOEL B. MARTIN, Lewiston, Idaho. *Lawyer; formerly printer and country newspaperman.*

SAMUEL MATHER, Union Trust Building, Cleveland, Ohio. *Senior Member, Pickands, Mather & Co., Cleveland, Ohio; Director, United States Steel Corporation.*

CLIFTON MATHEWS, Globe, Arizona. *Lawyer.*

JOHN LAWRENCE MAURAN, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Missouri. *Mauran, Russell & Crowell, Architects.*

HIRAM PERCY MAXIM, 410 Asylum Street, Hartford, Connecticut. *President, Maxim Silencer Company.*

LEWIS L. McARTHUR, M.D., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois.

P. A. McCARRAN, Reno, Nevada. *Attorney; Former Chief Justice, Nevada, Supreme Court; Former President, Nevada State Bar Association.*

THOMAS N. McCARTER, 80 Park Place, Newark, New Jersey. *President, Public Service Corporation of New Jersey.*

J. ROSS McCULLOCH, First National Bank Building, Fort Wayne, Indiana. *Vice President, First National Bank of Fort Wayne.*

STUART McGUIRE, M.D., McGuire Clinic, St. Luke's Hospital, Richmond, Virginia. *Surgeon.*

GEORGE W. MERCK, R. F. D. 129, West Orange, New Jersey. *President, Merck & Co., Inc.*

STEPHEN O. METCALF, 15 Westminster Street, Providence, Rhode Island. *Woolen and Worsted Manufacturer.*

WILLIAM H. METSON, Balboa Building, San Francisco, California. *Lawyer; Chairman, California Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*

DUNLEVY MILBANK, 52 William Street, New York, N. Y. *Lawyer.*

JOHN D. MILLER, 512 Whitney Building, New Orleans, Louisiana. *Lawyer.*

SIDNEY T. MILLER, Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan. *Partner, Miller, Canfield, Paddock & Stone, Lawyers.*

HERBERT C. MOFFITT, 1818 Broadway, San Francisco, California. *Doctor.*

W. W. MONTGOMERY, JR., 1421 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Lawyer.*

WILLIAM W. MOUNTAIN, Toledo, Ohio. *President, Mountain Varnish & Color Works.*

GENERAL THORNWELL MULLALLY, Hunter Dulin Building, San Francisco, California. *Lawyer.*

FRED T. MURPHY, M.D., 4350 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan. *Trustee.*

GRAYSON M.-P. MURPHY, 52 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Partner, G. M.-P. Murphy & Co., Bankers.*

EUGENE E. NEFF, El Paso, Texas. *President, Neff-Stiles Co., Wholesale Builders Supplies.*

WALDO NEWCOMER, 17 South Street, Baltimore, Maryland. *Chairman of the Executive Committee, Baltimore Trust Co.*

MEREDITH NICHOLSON, 625 Chamber of Commerce Building, Indianapolis, Indiana.

SAMUEL M. NICHOLSON, 23 Acorn Street, Providence, Rhode Island. *Manufacturer.*

HOFFMAN NICKERSON, West Shore Drive, Oyster Bay, Long Island, N. Y. *Author.*

COURTLANDT NICOLL, 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Shiland, Hedges, Nicoll & Pelham, Lawyers.*

W. E. NORVELL, JR., 709 Harry Nichol Building, Nashville, Tennessee. *Lawyer.*

THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Grand Rapids, Michigan. *Attorney-at-Law; former Ambassador.*

SAMUEL H. ORDWAY, 72 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *Lawyer; former Justice of the Supreme Court of New York.*

NORRIS G. OSBORN, New Haven, Connecticut. *Editor, the Journal-Courier.*

C. A. OTIS, Otis & Company, Cleveland, Ohio. *Banker.*

ROBERT TREAT PAINE, II, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer; Director, General Electric Company.*

WALTER W. PALMER, M.D., 620 West 168th Street, New York, N. Y. *Bard Professor of Medicine, Columbia University; Director, Medical Service, Presbyterian Hospital.*

WALTER PARKER, Fenner & Beane Building, New Orleans, Louisiana. *Economist, New Orleans and New York.*

WALTER O. PARMER, "Belle Meade," Nashville, Tennessee. *Retired.*

LEWIS H. PARSONS, 1422 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Partner, Graham, Parsons & Co., Bankers.*

STEWART PATON, M.D., 3908 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland. *Psychiatrist, Johns Hopkins Hospital.*

H. H. PATTERSON, Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Lawyer.*

J. MEDILL PATTERSON, 220 East 42nd Street, New York, N. Y. *Journalist.*

GENERAL FRANCIS PEABODY, 10 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer.*

RAYMOND PEARL, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. *Biologist; Statistician; Director of the Institute for Biological Research.*

R. A. F. PENROSE, JR., Bullitt Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Geologist and Author.*

SPENCER PENROSE, El Pomar, Colorado Springs, Colorado. *Capitalist.*

ALBERT T. PERKINS, 805 LaSalle Building, St. Louis, Missouri. *Railway Official.*

CHARLES C. PERKINS, Camarillo, California. *Rancher and President of the California Lima Bean Growers' Ass'n.*

CHARLES E. PERKINS, Santa Barbara, California. *Trustee; Director, Southern Pacific Company.*

MAXWELL E. PERKINS, New Canaan, Connecticut. *Editor, Charles Scribner's Sons, Publishers.*

JAMES J. PHELAN, 60 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Partner, Hornblower & Weeks.*

WILLIAM WALTER PHELPS, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *President, Kettleman Oil Corporation.*

THOMAS W. PHILLIPS, JR., Butler, Pennsylvania. *former member of Congress; President, T. W. Phillips Gas & Oil Co.*

CHARLES W. PILGRIM, M.D., Dr. MacDonald's House, Central Valley, New York. *Former Chairman, New York State Hospital Commission; Former President, American Psychiatric Association and other medical societies.*

RAYMOND PITCAIRN, 1830 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Architect and Lawyer.*

EDGAR ALLAN POE, Calvert & Redwood Streets, Baltimore, Maryland. *Lawyer; Former Attorney-General, Maryland.*

ALEXANDER J. PORTER, Room 208 E. & H. Building, Niagara Falls, New York. *Manufacturer.*

JOHN W. PRENTISS, 42 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Hornblower & Weeks.*

W. SCOTT PROSKEY, Reno, Nevada. *Mine Operator; Chairman, Nevada Committee of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*

PERCY R. PYNE, II, 50 East 42nd Street, New York, N. Y. *Retired.*

CHARLES S. RACKEMANN, 60 Ames Building, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer; President, Constitutional Liberty League of Massachusetts.*

JOHN J. RASKOB, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. *Capitalist.*

C. B. RAYMOND, Santa Barbara, California. *Retired Manufacturer.*

FERGUS REID, Norfolk, Virginia. *Cotton Merchant.*

T. A. RIORDAN, Flagstaff, Arizona. *President, Arizona Lumber and Timber Company.*

LUCIUS F. ROBINSON, 750 Main Street, Hartford, Connecticut. *Partner, Robinson, Robinson and Cole, Lawyers; former President, Connecticut State Bar Association.*

GEORGE E. ROOSEVELT, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Roosevelt and Son, Bankers.*

BRONSON C. RUMSEY, Cody, Wyoming. *Rancher.*

BENJAMIN RUSH, 16th and Arch Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *President, Insurance Company of North America and Associated Companies.*

WILLIAM E. RUSSELL, 199 Washington Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Lawyer.*

CHARLES H. SABIN, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Chairman of the Board, Guaranty Trust Company of New York.*

WILLIAM D. SARGENT, 60 Park Place, Newark, New Jersey.

MONELL SAYRE, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y. *Pension Expert.*

EDWARD SCHOENECK, 1400 State Tower Building, Syracuse, New York. *Lawyer.*

CHARLES SCRIBNER, JR., 597 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. *Publisher, Charles Scribner's Sons.*

HARRY SCULLIN, 6700 Manchester Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri. *President, Scullin Steel Works.*

HERBERT M. SEARS, 53 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Trustee; Member of the Executive Committee, New England Trust Co.*

J. J. SEELMAN, M.D., 69 E. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. *Specialist in diagnosis and internal medicine; Member Wisconsin State Board of Health; Chairman, Wisconsin Division, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, 324 West 86th Street, New York, N. Y. *McVickar Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University.*

JOHN L. SEVERANCE, 480 The Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio. *Retired.*

CECIL F. SHALLCROSS, 150 William Street, New York, N. Y. *Insurance President.*

ALFRED L. SHAPLEIGH, 4th Street and Washington Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri. *Chairman of the Board, Shapleigh Hardware Company.*

QUINCY A. SHAW, 14 Ashburton Place, Boston, Massachusetts. *Capitalist.*

RALPH M. SHAW, First National Bank Building, Chicago, Illinois. *Member of Firm of Winston, Strawn and Shaw, Lawyers.*

SAMUEL SLOAN, 43 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, City Bank Farmers Trust Company.*

F. DUMONT SMITH, First National Bank Building, Hutchinson, Kansas. *Lawyer.*

GEORGE T. SMITH, 85 Montgomery Street, Jersey City, New Jersey. *President, Joseph Dixon Crucible Company.*

W. HINCKLE SMITH, 123 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Capitalist.*

WILLIAM P. SMITH, 21 E. 40th Street, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, Association Against the Prohibition Amendment.*

NIKOLAI SOKOLOFF, 1220 Huron Road, Cleveland, Ohio. *Conductor, Cleveland Orchestra.*

FREDERIC E. SONDERN, M.D., 20 West 55th Street, New York, N. Y. *Clinical Pathologist; Member of Public Health Relations Committee, New York Academy of Medicine.*

SIDNEY SPITZER, The Nicholas Building Company, Toledo, Ohio. *Capitalist.*

FRANK SPURLOCK, Chattanooga, Tennessee. *Lawyer.*

E. MacD. STANTON, M.D., Medical Arts Building, Schenectady, New York. *Surgeon.*

W. H. STAYTON, Investment Building, Washington, D. C. *Founder of the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment; Lawyer; Former Naval Officer.*

CHARLES W. STERLING, Merchants Bank Building, St. Paul, Minnesota. *Partner, Sterling, Converse & Spence, Lawyers.*

WALTER W. STETTHEIMER, 62 First Street, San Francisco, California. *President, Neustadter Brothers.*

PERCY S. STRAUS, 151 West 34th Street, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, R. H. Macy and Co.*

MATT. I. SULLIVAN, 1108 Humboldt Building, San Francisco, California. *Attorney-at-Law.*

ALFRED H. SWAYNE, 1775 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *Vice President, General Motors Corporation.*

JAMES A. TALBOT, Bartlett Building, 7th and Spring Streets, Los Angeles, California. *Chairman of the Board, Richfield Oil Company of California.*

AUGUSTUS THOMAS, 11 Thomas Place, New Rochelle, New York. *Playwright.*

CHARLES S. THOMAS, First National Bank Building, Denver, Colorado. *Former Governor of Colorado and former U. S. Senator.*

ALEXANDER M. TUTHILL, M.D., Phoenix, Arizona. *Surgeon.*

JAMES TWOHY, Care of Twohy Brothers, Portland, Oregon. *Contractor.*

THOMAS J. TYNE, The National Building, Nashville, Tennessee. *Lawyer; Partner, Tyne, Peebles, Henry & Tyne; Vice President and General Counsel, The National Life and Accident Insurance Company.*

JOHN R. UMSTED, 21 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Vice President, Continental-Equitable Title and Trust Company.*

JOSEPH L. VALENTINE, 100 West Monroe Street, Chicago. Illinois. *Trustee.*

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR., Geneseo, New York. *Farmer.*

WILLIAM BELL WAIT, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y. *Partner, Wait & Johnston, Lawyers.*

GEORGE H. WALKER, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. *President, W. A. Harriman & Co., Bankers.*

WILLIAM I. WALTER, 2 East 55th Street, New York, N. Y. *Retired Merchant; Director, Lawyers Mortgage Co.*

BENTLEY W. WARREN, 30 State Street, Boston, Massachusetts. *Partner, Warren, Garfield, Whiteside & Lamson, Lawyers.*

JAMES E. WELLS, Buffalo, New York. *Vice President, The Marine Trust Company of Buffalo.*

BARRETT WENDELL, JR., 137 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Illinois. *Partner, Lee Higginson & Company.*

ALEX. M. WETHERILL, Stuart Building, Seattle, Washington. *Colonel, U. S. A. R. C.*

W. CHATTIN WETHERILL, 1608 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. *Educator.*

GEORGE WARREN WILDER, East Rindge, New Hampshire, *Retired Publisher.*

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS, Boatmen's Bank Building, St. Louis, Missouri. *Partner, Bryan, Williams, Cave & McPheeters, Attorneys; former U. S. Senator.*

LINSLY R. WILLIAMS, M.D., 5th Avenue and 103rd Street, New York, N. Y. *Director, New York Academy of Medicine.*

JOHN P. WILSON, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois. *Lawyer; Partner, Wilson, McIlvaine, Hale and Templeton.*

MATTHEW WOLL, 210 American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. *Vice President, American Federation of Labor.*

KENNETH A. WOOD, 287 Main Street, Buffalo, New York. *Member, New York Stock Exchange.*

ERNEST L. WOODWARD, Le Roy, New York. *Farmer.*

R. CHARLTON WRIGHT, 16 King Street, Colonial Place, Asheville, North Carolina. *Retired newspaper owner and editor.*

MAJOR-GENERAL W. M. WRIGHT, 3028 Q Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. *United States Army, Retired.*

Association Against the Prohibition Amendment

Chairman, Board of Directors

W. H. Stayton
Washington, D. C.

President

Henry H. Curran
21 East 40th Street
New York, N. Y.

Vice-Presidents

John C. Gebhart
Laurence Hamill
G. C. Hinckley
Louis Livingston
Larkin G. Mead
W. Scott Proskey
J. J. Seelman, M.D.
William P. Smith
Charles S. Wood

Treasurer

Charles H. Sabin
21 East 40th Street
New York, N. Y.

Secretary

Emmet Dougherty
National Press Building
Washington, D. C.

PAMPHLETS AVAILABLE

On application, any of the following pamphlets will be mailed, free of charge:

The Quebec System; a study in liquor control.

Annual Report for 1929.

Cost of Prohibition and Your Income Tax.

Measuring the Liquor Tide.

Government Liquor Control in Canada.

Reforming America with a Shot Gun.

The Last Outposts of Prohibition in Canada.

The Bratt System of Liquor Control in Sweden.

A Business Man's View of Prohibition. By Pierre S. duPont.

Finland's Prohibition.

England's Solution of the Liquor Problem.

●

IN PREPARATION

Reports on other pressing phases of the liquor problem will be published from time to time. Among those now in preparation are field studies of the liquor problem in Norway, Denmark and Western Europe. We shall issue soon an analysis of the economic effects of Prohibition in the United States.

●

BOOKS AVAILABLE

The A. B. C. of Prohibition. By Fabian Franklin; Harcourt, Brace & Co.

Prohibition or Control—Canada's Experience with the Liquor Problem; by Reginald E. Hose; Longmans, Green & Co.

Drink: Coercion or Control? by Rheta Childe Dorr; Stokes.

Before and After Prohibition; by Millard E. Tydings; the Macmillan Co.

Write to

ASSOCIATION AGAINST THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT

21 E. 40th Street **New York, N. Y.**